



Durham E-Theses

The personification of supreme evil in Christian thought: a study of origins

Learoyd, W. H. A.

How to cite:

Learoyd, W. H. A. (1940) *The personification of supreme evil in Christian thought: a study of origins*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/9575/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

THE PERSONIFICATION OF SUPREME EVIL
IN CHRISTIAN THOUGHT: A STUDY OF ORIGINS.

Thesis submitted for the Degree of
Doctor of Divinity, by

W. H. A. Learoyd.

Submitted..... 20th. April, 1940.

SYNOPSIS OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.

page
1.

The purpose of the thesis. A study of origins, and therefore largely confined to Biblical and Apocalyptic literature. The Old Testament evidence negative, but the Apocalyptic most positive. The New Testament mild, and relies on contemporary teaching. The belief in Satan not a basis of Doctrine, but very widely held --- vide Dictionary definition. Importance of language and translations, the word 'angel' being taken as an example. Problems in N.T. Weakness of English Versions.

CHAPTER II. THE OLD TESTAMENT.

5.

Basic meaning of root STN. Examples of its use of an earthly adversary. Numbers, Samuel, Kings. Study of examples from Psalms, with a criticism of A. V. and R.V. (also P.B.) rendering of Psalm CIX.6. Error due to the Vulgate. Opinions of modern scholars.

Job. Date of book. The Satan an angel. Purpose of Satan. A figure of the imagination and an angelic official. The servant of God: not essentially evil. God responsible for evil.

Zechariah. Not a unity, and late. The Fourth Vision, and the figure of the Satan. Similar to that of Job --- still an official. Perhaps refers to some earthly opposing force --- Ewald and L.E.Browne. A figment of the imagination. No dualism indicated.

Chronicles. Comparison with Samuel. Blame shifted to Satan. No definite article. Chronicles late, and reflects Persian influences. Dualism of latter may be responsible for introduction of Satan. LXX evidence, also that of Luther. Omission of the definite article; reference to Gesenius. Theory of an earthly adversary being indicated. Support for this theory, showing that the 'adversary' may have been either a foreigner or one of the Israelites. Hebrew looks to the consequences.

Review of O.T. evidence, showing it to be of a negative character. Most unlike the Dictionary definition.

Torczyner's theory of 'Satan' having originally meant 'The Rover.' Job and Zechariah. Criticism of the theory in the light of the dating of different portions of the Old Testament.

CHAPTER III. EVIL IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

24.

Evil to be traced to God. Amos. Hebrew religion of a very primitive nature, and could regard some other god as being responsible. Example of Mesha of Moab. Advent of monotheism makes God responsible. Deutero-Isaiah. Moral as well as material evil attributed to God. Proverbs and Lamentations. Micah's Vision and the lying spirit from the Lord. Barnes' view. Influence of ideas of transcendence result in the introduction of intermediaries: hence 'the Adevsary' appears, although all his actions are dictated by God. This philosophy necessary as a safeguard against polytheism and dualism. The ultimate dilemma. Investigation of the theory that dualism came from Babylon. Criticism of this in the light of modern researches --- quotation from Langdon. Dualism rather of Persian origin --- quotation from Cheyne.

CHAPTER IV. SATAN IN THE APOCRYPHA.

31.

Reasons for inserting such a chapter. Attitude of Church of England contrasted with that of Church of Rome. Vast importance of the Apocrypha: influence on N.T. and Early Church.

Ecclesiasticus. Psychological approach to the problem of evil. This reduced to the 'evil imagination.' Important evidence of the original Hebrew. Slight psychological dualism, but this only superficial, for God is still responsible for evil. Quotation from N.P. Williams. Satan equated with the 'evil imagination'. Parallel from the Talmud. No personification of evil.

Tobit. Asmodeus. Book largely Iranian. Aeshma-Daeva: not the Persian God of evil, but only an arch-demon. Flight to Egypt. Kohut's suggestion. Asmodeus

in the Talmud, and attempted Hebrew derivation. Kaminka's theory that Asmodeus is the Smerdis of Herodotus. Asmodeus not to be identified with the Devil.

Wisdom. Mild dualism. Evil and death not due to God. "The envy of the devil." Varying views held by different scholars. Objections to seeing a reference to Genesis III. Cain and Abel incident to be preferred, supported by the Fathers. Absence of the definite article. Suggestion that not Satan, but an earthly adversary is indicated, viz: Cain. Meaning of DIABOLOS, with references to Maccabees and Acts. Avoidance of proper names.

I. Maccabees. One passage only to be investigated. DIABOLOS used of a locality; and cannot have its Classical meaning. Word used in the Hebrew original. Is DIABOLOS really evil?

Baruch. Late date. Single reference to demons. Evil traced back to God.

II. Esdras. Title and nature. No references to the Devil. Evil associated with the 'evil imagination'. The keeping of the Law not enough, for the 'evil imagination' is now inherent in man. The 'cor malignum' is handed on to all the progeny of Adam.

General survey. Conception of Apocrypha found to be mainly that of O.T. A slight psychological dualism, and a development of the doctrine of the 'evil imagination.' Strong criticism of Oeserley's statement that there is implied "a belief in demons as his (Satan's) army of subordinates. Refutation of this from Oesterley's own writings.

CHAPTER V. THE SEPTUAGINT.

56.

Necessary that such a section should be included. The LXX a Targum. Contemporary with the literature in which a personal Satan originated. Influence on N.T. and Early Church. Swete's appreciation.

DIABOLOS used to translate STN, also DIABALLO and DIABOLE. Meaning of these words in Classical Greek. Evil force -- "slanderer" --- references to Plato, Thucydides, Aristophanes, etc.

Greek word seems to have a worse sense than the Hebrew STN, although it appears at times to have undergone a change of meaning, indicating something less evil than in the Classical language. This shown by its being used for 79 in Esther. Cannot mean 'slanderer' in I. Maccabees.

Have these three Greek words ever their Classical meaning in the LXX? DIABOLE shown to have both meanings; as is DIABALLO. This is likely with DIABOLOS.

Definite article always present in Job and Zechariah with DIABOLOS, unless in the Vocative. Omitted in Psalms, I. Macc., and I. Chron. --- in all these passages seeming to refer to an earthly adversary. Also lacking in Wisdom II.

Use of $\epsilon\alpha\rho\alpha\nu$ to represent STN in Kingdoms. Always of an earthly adversary. Bearing of this upon N.T.

Use of $\epsilon\pi\iota\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ for STN. Not in N.T.

LXX ascription to some other of an action ascribed to God in the Hebrew. Example from Exodus. Myth of the Watchers. LXX responsible for the word 'Grigori'.

CHAPTER VI. THE APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

70.

Introduction. O.T. and Apocrypha negative. N.T. teaching looks back to the apocalyptic. Theories as to evolution of apocalyptic. Essenes, Pharisees, non-Pharisaic Alexandrian scribes. Suggestion that Persian influence is the most likely, based on dualism and Last Judgment. These two characteristic of apocalyptic. Personal Devil appears, the arch-enemy of man. Evil now attributed to Satan, and not to God. New names for Satan. New meanings read into the Fall-story. Myth of the Watchers. Last Judgment and end of dualism. Quotation from Burkitt. N.T. references due to apocalyptic, and to be explained by it. Fairweather's summary.

Ethiopic Enoch. Importance of the book demonstrated from Jude and other N.T. writings. Influence on Early Church: Tertullian and later writers. N.T. doctrine of evil largely to be explained from Enoch. The Myth of the Watchers --- traced through Genesis, Daniel, Jubilees, and the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs. The Myth in Enoch; archangels and fallen angels. The Watchers, their names and their number. Evil due to the Fall of the Watchers. Evil spirits. Azazel the enemy of mankind, and seems to be the counterpart of the later Satan. A dualism presupposed, but this of a transitory nature. The punishment and the end of Azazel. Parallels in Matthew and Revelation. Azazel a star: parallel to this in Revelation. Comparison with Lucifer in Isaiah.

Azazel responsible for all sin. References to the Fallen Angels in the N.T. --- Jude, II. Peter, I. Corinthians (covering of women's heads). Attitude of Tertullian. Personification of evil, and polysatanism.

The Parables of Enoch and the Satans. Their functions: as accusers, as seducers, as angels of punishment. N.T. parallels. Gadreel, one of the Satans, identified with the serpent. Gadreel responsible for man's knowledge of the weapons of war: also Azazel. Single passage associating moral evil with the Fall of Adam. Mental and physical diseases due to the Satans. N.T. parallels, also possible references to the Satans in the N.T.

The Book of Jubilees. Nature of work, and its importance. Satan an evil person of great power, although this power will come to an end. The name Mastema, its origin and future history. Mastema the chief of the spirits; and identical with Satan. Contrasted with the O.T. Satan. His functions, and his responsibility for much of the evil mentioned in the O.T. --- Abraham and Isaac, the slaying of the firstborn, the Egyptian magicians and army, God's attempt upon the life of Moses. Parallels in Chronicles. The name Beliar. The Fall-story, and the nature of the serpent. The kingdom of demons.

The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs. Frequent mention of the Devil, also of spirits. The Devil the lord of the spirits. Beliar. A dualism, but this of a transitory character. Beliar harmless to the righteous of Israel. Stress laid on fornication. High ethical teaching. Importance of the 'evil imagination.' The Devil responsible for some of the O.T. evil --- Joseph's brethren, the sin of

Dan, and Potiphar's wife. Influence on the N.T. illustrated from the Epistle of James; also from the reference to Belial in II. Corinthians. The 'power of the air' of Ephesians looks back to the Testaments. Pre-Christian additions examined, also those that are post-Christian.

The Psalms of Solomon. Date and nature. References to Pompey as the 'lawless one' --- contrasted with II. Thessalonians. Pompey spoken of as 'the dragon'. Serpent of the Fall-story mentioned, but not identified with Satan.

The Zadokite Fragments. Date and nature. Sin due to the Fall of the Watchers: cause of this fornication and the 'evil imagination'. The Devil never called Satan in this work, but Mastema once. Belial the favourite name. The 'nets of Belial' compared with the 'snare of the devil' in the Pastorals. Reference to the enchanters of Pharaoh draw their power from Belial. These two mention by name, as in the Pastorals. Belial regarded as being responsible for witchcraft. Belial punishes sinners. Possible parallels in the N.T.

The Assumption of Moses. Composite nature of the work. The Testament of Moses and the lost Assumption. A single reference to Satan in the former: this shown to exhibit more of the Apocalyptic conception than that of the O.T. Importance of the lost Assumption. Charles' reconstruction. The nature of the Devil in this. Dualism revealed, and even a suggestion as to the evil nature of matter. The Devil inspired the serpent, but was not identical with it. A parallel to this found in the Revelation of Moses. The introduction of the figure of Satan into O.T. incidents. Illustration of further parallels between Jude and the original Testament of Moses.

The Slavonic Book of Enoch. Nature and importance. The Myth of the Watchers restated with fresh details. The Grigori, their size, number, and other characteristics. Satanail. The Testament of Dan. The Creation-story, and the fall of Satan to the kingdom of the air. Comparison with the Test: Benjamin, and Ephesians. Athanasius and the demons of the upper air. Supposed fall of Lucifer in Isaiah. Free-will of man. Identification of Satan with the serpent. Envy was Satan's motive. This contrasted with the identification in Ethiopic Enoch. A dualism implicit, but this not absolute.

The Sibylline Books. The word Beliar used of an earthly individual; either Nero or Simon Magus. References to the

Acts of the Apostles, and to the Acts of Peter and Paul. Comparison with II. Corinthians and the Psalms of Solomon.

The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch. Character of work. Death due to the Fall of Adam, also diseases, etc. Parallels in the N.T. Man has free-will. Satan and the serpent are not identified. Evil not personified, although some demons are mentioned. Sirens. Lilin. Shedim. Dragons. Behemoth and Leviathan; the appearances of these in Mediaeval thought.

The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch. Nature and date. The treatment of the Fall-story of Genesis III. Importance of the vine; with parallels from Later Judaism and Methodius. Satan called Sammael; history and implications of this term. Sammael's attributes in Judaism. The evilness of wine. The complete identification of Sammael with the serpent.

Brief summary of the contribution of the Apocalyptic Literature.

CHAPTER VII.

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

173

General introduction. The different Greek names employed. Emphasis laid on their ambiguity.

St. Mark. Paucity of references: Satan used five times, the Devil never. Conception of Job often evident; as in the rebuke of Peter. This contrasted with Matthew and Luke. The Temptation also manifests the Job idea, being part of the Divine plan. Discussion of the meaning of the verb 'to tempt', in Classical Greek and in the LXX. Different attitudes revealed by Matthew and Luke, who both substitute the word 'Devil.' Similar phenomenon in the interpretation of the parable of the sower: changes in words, etc. Beelzebub. The chief of the spirits. History of the word, and its derivation. 'Lord of flies'; 'Lord of dung'; 'Lord of the high house.' Does Jesus speak of the Satans? Mark's version here unique; transformed by Matthew and Luke. A further reference to Beelzebub in Matthew and Luke. Why did the scribes say that Jesus cast out demons by the power of Beelzebub? Summary of Marcan evidence.

St. Matthew. Words used. Examination of the three

instances of the word Satan. Uses of the word Devil. The incident of the Temptations. View of Montefiore. Symbolic nature. Two references to the Devil peculiar to Matthew. Their apocalyptic nature. The Tares. Vulgate evidence of doubt as to meaning of word 'evil (one)'. The sheep and the goats. Parallels in the apocalypses. 'By the devil', or 'for the devil'? Use of the word *πονηρ* of the Devil. This present in the Sower: but doubtful in the Lord's Prayer, and in the teaching on oaths. The 'tempter'. Summary of Matthean evidence.

St. Luke. Words used. Substitution of 'devil' for the 'Satan' of Mark. Satan and Judas. Borrowings from Mark. The woman who had been bound by Satan: association of Satan with disease in apocalypses and elsewhere. "Satan as lightning falling from heaven." Association of this with Isaiah XIV. Suggestions as to correct interpretation. Fall of Satan in the apocalypses. A new interpretation. Summary of Lucan evidence.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PAULINE EPISTLES

217

Writings included in this section. No use of word 'Devil'; although Satan appears eight times. Doubt as to meaning of the term. Job conception sometimes preponderating: sexual temptation, supported by examples from the apocalypses attributing the Fall of the Watchers to fornication. "Satan hindered us" reflects an O.T. conception. Excommunication, and the idea of Satan being able to afflict the body. Does Paul imply a knowledge of the Satans in his reference to the thorn in the flesh? Satan as an angel of light. Ideas of Job, Jewish legends, and the Apocalypse of Moses. "Lest Satan take advantage." Idea of temptation present. The crushing of Satan: this not necessarily a reference to the Fall-story of Genesis. Satan in the apocalyptic section of II. Thessalonians.

Two passages examined which seem to show that Paul was conversant with current theories. "The god of this world" seems to indicate an advanced dualism; but the passage admits of another rendering. The Destroyer introduced into the incident from Numbers dealing with the death of the murmurers. Did Paul identify the serpent with Satan? Paul's knowledge of the Myth of the Watchers, examples from the injunctions regarding the veiling of women. Summary of Pauline teaching.

CHAPTER IX.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

The word DIABOLOS used in its Classical sense of 'slanderer' on three occasions. The same word twice employed with reference to the 'snare of the devil.' This contrasted both with Job and with the 'nets of the devil (Belial)' in the Zadokite Fragments. Pharaoh's magicians mentioned by name in both the Zadokite Fragments and the Pastorals. Parallel to the 'snare of the devil' noted in Ecclesiasticus. Remaining instance of the word DIABOLOS. "The condemnation of the devil." Various suggestions.

Name Satan twice employed. In a form of excommunication, similar to that of I. Corinthians. Also used of the spirit of temptation. Does the 'adversary' mentioned here refer to Satan? Reasons for rejecting this suggestion, contrasting the passage with I. Peter. Use of 'Anticiminus' in the Biblical Antiquities of Philo.

CHAPTER X.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

244

Single reference to the Devil, who is here depicted as the Lord of Death. Comparison with the Fourth Gospel. Attitude towards death in Wisdom, Ethiopic Enoch, and the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch. Also in Ecclesiasticus and the Talmud. Quotation from Charles. Death and the woman in the Slavonic Book of Enoch. Satan and the Angel of Death. Identification of the two in the Talmud.

Nature of the passage in Hebrews. Correct translation. Logical implications of the passage. The defeat of death. Comparison with Revelation.

CHAPTER XI.

THE EPISTLES OF JAMES, PETER, AND JUDE

253

James. Jewish character of this writing. Evil regarded as being something internal rather than external. Reflection of the doctrine of the 'evil imagination'. Attitude towards temptation: this identified with the 'evil imagination.' Parallels from Ecclesiasticus and the Zadokite Fragments. The patience of Job. Satan seemingly identified with the 'evil imagination'. Parallels to this idea taken from Ecclesiasticus and the Talmud. Single reference to Satan. 'Resist the devil.'

Seems to refer to temptation. Close verbal parallel in the Testament of Naphtali. The Devil of James most unlike that of the Dictionary definition. Summary of James' teaching.

I. and II. Peter. Single reference to the Devil. 'Your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour.' This conception partly due to Job. Influence of Psalm XXI apparent. Does διάβολος lack the definite article? Suspected influence of the Aramaic and Syriac expression for 'slanderer'. Possible reference to earthly persecution; but this conception not dualistic in outlook. Parallel to the idea of resisting the Devil noted in James. Reference to the Myth of the Watchers in II. Peter. Parallels in Ethiopic Enoch.

Jude. Single reference to the Devil. This dependent on the lost Assumption of Moses. Reasons for supporting this derivation. The character of the Devil in this lost writing. "The Lord rebuke thee"--- Zechariah and later Judaism. The story of Pelimo from the Talmud. Michael as the opponent of Satan: parallels in Daniel and Revelation. The Myth of the Watchers in Jude. This borrowed from Ethiopic Enoch. Further quotations from this book, and from the extant Assumption of Moses. Summary of the evidence.

CHAPTER XII. THE JOHANNINE GOSPEL AND EPISTLES

271.

Words employed. Single instance of term 'Satan'. Reasons for thinking that this has been taken from Luke. Judas prompted by the Devil. Supposed dualism of the Fourth Gospel. Application of this theory to the references to the Devil. Use of DIABOLOS; applied to Judas Iscariot, and here seems to have its LXX force of 'enemy'. Similarity of this to the rebuke of Peter at Caesarea Philippi. Seemingly dualistic reference to the Devil in the words:- "Ye are of your father the devil." The Devil a murderer; association of this with Cain's murder of Abel. The word 'murderer.' The Devil a liar. Alternative translation of this passage. Beliefs of the Ophites, and a quotation from Irenaeus. Negative attitude of modern scholars towards this attempted explanation. The 'prince of this world.' Parallels in II. Corinthians and Ephesians: also in the apocalypses, especially the Ascension of Isaiah.

The judgment of the Devil. References not to Judas but to death --- Satan identified with the Angel of Death. This compared with the teaching of Hebrews.

This dualism apparent in the Johannine epistles. The Devil opposed to God. The Devil called the Evil One. Passages noted in which ὁ ἀντίχριστος appears. References to the Antichrist in the epistles.

The Antichrist Myth. The traces of the Myth in Daniel, referring to Antiochus Epiphanes. Also in the Psalms of Solomon, Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, and II. Esdras, referring to Rome. A modified conception revealed in the Johannine epistles.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE ACTS AND EPHESIANS.

286

Acts. Names used. All references in speeches or conversations. Incident of Ananias. Satan here resembles that of Job. Discussion of verb 'to cheat' in Greek. The voice on the Damascus road: Satan not introduced until Paul's speech before Agrippa. The Devil responsible for bodily sickness. Parallels in the apocalypses, also in Luke. 'Son of the Devil'. Absence of the definite article. The expression 'firstborn of Satan' in the Talmud and the Fathers.

Ephesians. Name used. Two examples, first of which is akin to the Job conception. Other interpretations: Luther and the Syriac. Second example: apocalyptic conception. This seen also in the reference to the 'prince of the power of the air.' Parallels in the apocalypses. The 'darts of the evil one.' Evidence of the Versions.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE BOOK OF REVELATION

299

Frequent references to the Devil. Satan and the Devil identical; also the serpent. Two examples of this. Apocalyptic conception revealed. A dualism, but transitory: references to the end of Satan. Parallels in Enoch. The Synagogue of Satan. The Devil and persecution. The Devil and Nero: Emperor worship at Pergamum. Satan the accuser; parallel in Enoch.

The Neronic Myth. The belief that Nero would

return --- in Classical writers; in Judaism; in Revelation. Nero identical with the Beast. Satan and the Beast not to be identified.

page

Satan and the Dragon. Gunkel's theory. Arguments in favour of this interpretation.

CHAPTER XV.

SATAN AND THE SERPENT.

309

Papal edict of 1909, enjoining that Satan and the serpent should be identified. Examination of the negative evidence of the Old Testament. Suggestion that the serpent's introduction into the Fall-story is due to aetiological causes. Moses and the serpent. Hezekiah's reforms and the casting out of the serpent. Evidence of Apocrypha shown to be almost negative. Identification found in some of the apocalypses; but not universally accepted. The New Testament negative in its evidence apart from Revelation: but the idea may have been known to the writer of the Fourth Gospel.

Development of the conception in various writers:- Revelation of Moses, Josephus, Ignatius. Eve and the serpent: quotations from Clement of Alexandria and Theophilus. Methodius and the fig-leaves. Evidence from Justin Martyr, Clementine Homilies, Recognitions of Clement, Pseudo-Ignatius, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Jerome, and Gregory of Nyssa.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE INCARNATION OF SATAN

320

Similar attitude of men towards God and Satan. The Messianic hope. Satan given an earthly body: Satan as Pompey: and as Nero. Evidence of Psalms of Solomon, Sibylline Oracles, and the Ascension of Isaiah. The Emperor cult in Revelation: other explanations of this passage.

Theories of Satan's incarnation modified: now no longer necessarily a king, but any person opposed to Christianity. Christ and Belial. The name Belial. The 'man of lawlessness' of Thessalonians. Antichrist. Satan and heresy.

Attitude of the Fathers towards Antichrist:- Jerome,

Chrysostom, Hippolytus, and Ambrosiaster.

page

Satan allowed a weighty body: Slavonic Life of Adam and Eve. Satan's footsteps.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE NAME LUCIFER

329

Single occurrence in Scripture: in the Latin Versions of Isaiah XIV. 12. Does not refer to the Devil. Influences of the apocalypses. The New Testament and the fall of Satan. The Isaiah passage and Luke X. 18 associated together by Tertullian and Origen. Jerome says Satan and the old serpent and Lucifer are identical. Attitude towards the followers of Lucifer of Cagliari. Possible play upon the word. Wycliffe, Coverdale, and Shakespeare.

APPENDIX A.

336

Table showing actions once ascribed to God, but later to the Devil.

APPENDIX B.

337

Table showing several instances in later literature where the Devil is held responsible for actions not ascribed to him in earlier writings.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

Stated briefly, the purpose of this thesis is to investigate the evolution of the Christian belief in the Devil. Essentially a study of origins, it makes no pretence at being a philosophical enquiry into this belief. It is along lines which are rather historical than metaphysical, rather philological than philosophical, that this investigation must pursue its course.

First there must be examined the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, for these, when combined in the Septuagint Version, formed the Bible of the early Christians. This, it will be seen, proves to be a somewhat negative field of research: there is no Devil in the Old Testament, and there is almost none in the Apocrypha.

The next stage of our investigations is destined to produce very positive results. This is that vast corpus of literature which goes to make up the Apocalypses and the Pseudepigrapha. Its importance cannot be over-stressed, for now, thanks to the labours of many scholars --- more especially Dr. Charles --- during the last half-century, we are well aware of the great influence exercised by this literature on the New Testament and the Fathers.

Finally, the New Testament will be examined in considerable detail, due reference being paid to the contributions of the Fathers and contemporary Jewish writers. The New Testament will be found to furnish few, if any, conceptions which depart from current beliefs. The Devil is very often mentioned, but neither Christ nor the Apostles set up any new doctrine about him; they never put forward the idea that belief in him is a condition of faith in God or Christ. There is no New Testament justification for the question which Luther asked, when testing a Christian geacher: "Does he believe in death and the Devil?"

In spite of those few in the Church who, with the tenacity of a drowning man, cling to a belief in a Personal Devil, the Church itself has never regarded such a belief as a basis of doctrine; nor is any clause embodying such a belief to be found included in its formularies of faith. But still, the belief does exist; so strongly, indeed, that the New English Dictionary does not hesitate to give the following definition: "DEVIL. In Jewish and Christian theology, the proper appellation of the supreme spirit of evil, the tempter and spiritual enemy of mankind, the foe of God and holiness, otherwise called Satan."

Yet, as we shall see, at the base of all this lies one simple Hebrew word meaning nothing more sinister than an earthly opponent or adversary. Many forces have, of course,

been at work to cause so vast a growth of belief to spring from one single word. And amongst these must be noted a careless use of language: the unfortunate fact that few words of one tongue find their exact equivalents when they have been translated into another tongue. Often enough is this to be observed when studying the Greek and Latin Versions of the Hebrew Old Testament, some of the words of the translations possessing a far different connotation from those of the original.

A good example of this is to be seen in the instance of the term 'angel.' In Hebrew מַלְאָכִים means either an earthly messenger or an angel; its Greek equivalent means, in the Classical language, either a loquacious person or an announcer; in the LXX and the New Testament, an announcer or an angel. But the Latin equivalent - 'angelus' - almost always means an angel. The result of all this is that although there is some doubt as to whether the Hebrew and Greek words indicate a natural or a supernatural being, there is no doubt whatever about the supernatural meaning of the word in the Vulgate.

This tendency can be seen helping to develop the conception of Satan. In the Hebrew שָׂטָן means an adversary or an opponent. The favourite translation given in the LXX is διάβολος, a word with a far more evil meaning than that of adversary; for it can also mean a slanderer. With much

justification did the author of the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus write:- "For things originally spoken in Hebrew have not the same force in them, when they are translated into another tongue: and not only these, but the law itself, and the prophecies, and the rest of the books, have no small difference, when they are spoken in their original language."

In many ways, then, this thesis will perforce have to pay minute attention to language, more especially to that of the translations of the Old Testament. The Greek of the New Testament will also require careful study. Why do St. Matthew and St. Luke change the *Σατανᾶς* of St. Mark into *διάβολος*? Why does St. Paul, in those Epistle of unquestioned authenticity, always use the word *Σατανᾶς*? Again, the importance of a study of language is to be seen in the Vulgate. Satan is the Satan or the Devil in the Hebrew or the Greek. But Latin has no definite article; hence Satan vanishes as an official, but emerges as a person.

Nor are our English Versions entirely free from such weaknesses. One cause which has been responsible for the over-stressing of the Devil's importance is the fact that the Authorised Version does not distinguish in translation between what are two entirely different words. The translation 'devil' is used indiscriminately for both *διάβολος* and *δαίμων*. Thus we read that Mary Magdalene had been possessed by 'seven devils,' when nothing more than possession by

seven evil spirits is indicated in the original Greek. In a similar way, Beelzebul is spoken of as being 'the prince of the devils' (Matthew XII.25.) thereby causing English readers to imagine that the New Testament postulates the existence of legions of Satans.

It is to be regretted that those responsible for the Revised Version did not trouble to correct this potential cause of mis-interpretation. All that they did was to insert in their margin the very frequently recurring note to indicate that the Greek text has 'demon'. How serious is this weakness of the English Versions may well be judged from the fact that the misrepresentation occurs no less than 59 times in the New Testament. Moffatt obviates this error by regularly employing the translation 'daemon.'

CHAPTER II.

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The use of the word $\gamma\psi$ in the Old Testament must first be examined. The general definition given is:- 'An adversary, personal or national; a superhuman adversary, (with the definite article).' There is also found a denominative verb $\gamma\psi$, possessing the general meaning of to be an adversary, or to act as an adversary (vide Oxford Hebrew Lexicon.) There are several occasions on which the

word is used with this simple meaning of adversary. Thus the angel that opposed Balaam and his ass (Numbers XXII.22.) is in the same sentence spoken of as 'an angel of God' and as a 'satan.' Again, in the Books of Samuel, when the Philistines under Achish their king were on the verge of attacking the Israelites under Saul, and David and his men were about to fight in the ranks of the Philistines, the latter objected, lest, in the day of battle, David should become a 'satan' to them, by deserting to the enemy (1. Samuel, XXIX, 4.)

When David, in later life, was returning to Jerusalem, after Absalom's rebellion and death, when his recently disaffected subjects were, in their turn, making their submission, there came the truculent Shimei. Abishai, David's nephew, advised that Shimei should be put to death; this offended David, at a moment when he was delighted at his restoration, and he rebuked Abishai as being a 'satan' to him (2. Samuel, XIX, 22.) Solomon, in his message to Hiram, king of Tyre, congratulated himself on having no 'satan', holding that this peaceful immunity from discord enabled him to build the Temple, which had been forbidden to his warlike father David (1. Kings, V, 4.). This immunity was not, however, of a lasting nature; for Hadad the Edomite, and Rezon of Zobah, became 'satans' to Solomon, after his profuse luxury had opened the way for corruption and disaffection. (1. Kings, XI, 14, 23, 25.)

All these instances serve to render it manifest that the underlying idea is nothing more than the plain basic meaning of the word. A 'satan' is merely an opponent, or an adversary.

SATAN IN THE PSALMS.

The Hebrew root STN is used six times in the Book of Psalms. Five of these instances need not enter into our investigations, since they are usages - in either the Participle or the Imperfect - of the verb SATAN, meaning nothing more than to oppose. At no time has any attempt been made to force into these examples any reference to a personal Satan. The LXX uniformly renders by the verb εὐδι(βάλλω, and the Vulgate follows this by a similar use of detraho. As is well known, our English Versions always translate by 'adversaries.'

But in Psalm CIX, 6. ("Set thou a wicked man over him: and let an adversary stand at his right hand" R.V. rendering) we meet with a rather more complicated phenomenon. Here the Hebrew has the singular noun - וְיָשִׁבֵּן עָלָיו אֹיֵב - and several attempts have been made to translate this as a reference to Satan. The LXX gives καὶ διάβολος στήτω, the Vulgate, 'et diabolus stet.' The tragic consequences of the Vulgate having been written in a language which possesses no definite article are to be seen in Wycliffe's translation:- "Sett up on hym a synere; and the devell stand at his right side."

Our Authorised Version reads:- "Set thou a wicked man over him: and let Satan stand at his right hand." The Prayer Book Version is similar:- "And let Satan stand at his right hand." But it should be noted that the A.V. does not hesitate to give the marginal reading of 'an adversary' for 'Satan.' The Revised Version renders by:- "And let an adversary stand at his right hand." This is supported by no less an authority than the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon. There seems, then, to be little doubt as to which is the correct translation, for שָׂטָן , if it were to be rendered by 'Satan', should have had the definite article, as in Job and Zechariah. Luther gives a translation similar to that of our Prayer Book Version:- "Und der Satan müsse stehen zu seiner Rechten."

As we have already indicated, the rendering of 'Satan' would seem to have been due to the influence of the Vulgate. There is also another factor which may have had some bearing on the matter. It is well known that parallelism is one of the characteristics of Hebrew poetry, and it would seem as though later interpreters had regarded 'Satan' as being a better parallel to 'sinner' than would have been 'adversary.' Not that happy results are always to be obtained by an overstressed parallelism, as may well be seen from some of the textual emendations suggested for the poetical books of the Old Testament during the last hundred years.

It is worthy of comment that Jerome did not transliterate the Hebrew word שָׂטָן : he translated by 'diabolus.'⁸

This is but one of the many instances of later interpreters striving to read references to the Devil into passages which are really devoid of such meanings. Especially outstanding instances of this are the abuses of such terms as Belial, Beelzebub, Leviathan, and Lucifer.

All modern commentators agree in regarding SATAN in this passage as meaning an earthly adversary. Briggs (Int. Crit. Commentary) says:- "While the word for adversary is the same as that for Satan, the context does not suggest a trial in heaven, as Zechariah III.1., where a wicked judge would be impossible, but on earth, where supreme judges are not unfrequently (sic) supreme in wickedness." (Vol. II, p.369). In a similar way Barnes (Westminster Commentary) remarks:- "In this Psalm the meaning of 'adversary' or 'Satan' is simply 'accuser'" (Vol.II, p.529). J. Cales (Le Livre des Psaumes) gives the translation:- "Et qu'un accusateur se tienne à sa droite." (p. 325), also the comment:- "Satan paraît être ici un nom commun: 'un ennemi', 'un accusateur', pas encore le nom propre du chef des demons, l'ennemi capital de Dieu et des hommes" (p.330.). Kittel (Die Psalmen) translates:- "Und ein Ankläger steh ihm zur Rechten" (p.353.)

In view of this, we may summarise our conclusions in a single sentence. There is no reference to the Devil in the Hebrew text of the Book of Psalms.

Having thus completed our survey of the Psalms, we may note that the term שָׂטָן would seem to be used of a supernatural figure in some post-exilic books, i.e. Job, Zechariah, and, possibly, Chronicles. In our English Versions the translation is always 'Satan;' in the LXX it is always δίαβολος . The word as used in each of these books must now be studied in considerable detail.

SATAN IN JOB.

Although the scene of the story of the Book of Job is laid in patriarchal times, the book itself manifestly belongs to the post-exilic period. Not only do many of its allusions postulate a late date; there is also the evidence furnished by its language. In the words of S. R. Driver: "The language of Job points to a relatively late date. The syntax is extremely idiomatic; but the vocabulary contains a very noticeable admixture of Aramaic words, and (in a minor degree) of words explicable only from the Arabic. This is an indication of a date more or less contemporary with II. Isaiah; though it appears that the author came more definitely within the range of Aramaizing influences than the author of Isaiah 40 - 66, and perhaps had his home in proximity to Aramaic- and Arabic-speaking peoples." (Intro. to the Literature of the Old Testament, page 434.)

It is, therefore, safe for us to place the writing of

the Book of Job in the post-exilic period, in spite of the statement in the Talmud that:- "Moses wrote his own book and the portion of Balaam, and Job." (Baba Bathra, 14b.)

From the aspect of a study of Satan it is only the first two chapters of the book that are of outstanding importance. They form a prologue to the entire book, and many modern scholars have come to the conclusion that they were a later addition, written by a different hand. The first chapter opens with a picture of Job, emphasis being laid upon his prosperity and his righteousness. With verse 6 the picture changes; we are permitted to view the heavenly council-meeting. The Lord presides, and the sons of the Elohim (LXX. "angels of God") present themselves before him. Included in their number is Satan, or, rather, the Satan - for in the Book of Job the word $\gamma\psi\psi$ always has the definite article. Here we must note the great paradox: the one who was later to be known as the supreme spirit of evil seems to be perfectly at home in heaven; nor does God appear to think that his presence amongst the 'Sons of God' is at all incongruous.

The Lord asks the Satan from whence he had come. In his reply he reveals that his pursuits had been quite innocent:- "From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it." How different a view of these earthly perambulations of Satan was held by the Early Church may be seen from the verse:- "Brethren, be sober, be vigilant; because

your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." (1. Peter, V. 8.)

One of the questions discussed at this heavenly council is the matter of Job's piety, and Satan asks the rather pertinent question, "Does Job serve God for nought?" He suggests that, if Job were to suffer earthly misfortunes, he would not hesitate to renounce God. The latter now gives Satan permission to test Job --- "all that he hath is in thy power." The sequel to all this is that misfortunes begin to shower down on Job; the erstwhile wealthy sheik is stricken with the loss of his property and of his children. But still he remains righteous.

The second chapter of the book depicts another heavenly council meeting. Again the sons of God come before the Lord; again Satan is of their number. As on the previous occasion, the question of Job's righteousness is discussed. The Lord emphasises the fact that in spite of his trials, Job has still remained righteous. Satan suggests that hitherto the trials have not affected the actual person of Job; that he would renounce God if he were tried by bodily suffering. The Lord responds by giving Satan permission to test Job in this way:- "Behold, he is in thine hand; only spare his life." Thereupon Satan brings upon Job a painful and humiliating sickness - probably black leprosy or elephantiasis - but he does not find that the patient

renounces his Maker. All references to the heavenly council meeting now vanish, and the main action of the book begins.

Such are the appearances of Satan in the Book of Job. Certain outstanding facts emerge from a consideration of the evidence now in our hands.

(1). The whole story is but a figment of the human imagination: it has nothing to do with history. The figures of Satan and of the 'Sons of God' have no more real an existence than the characters of Pilgrim's Progress.

(2). Satan always has the definite article. He is rather an official than a person. He is not Satan: he is "the adversary." St. Gregory's dictum on the word 'angel' may well be extended to Satan --- "nomen est officii, non naturae."

(3). Satan is entirely the servant of God. His actions are directed by God; their scope is limited by God. He has his seat on the heavenly council. He is an angel, a son of God. Nowhere is he spoken of as a slanderer. There is nothing to suggest that he is the Evil One, the Lord of the Realms of Hell.

(4). Satan merely inflicts trials on men for God. He does not directly incite men to sin.

(5). The problem of evil is reduced to God. Material losses, earthly misfortunes, bodily illnesses and death, all are traced ultimately to a divine cause. Satan is merely the agent who inflicts these hardships.

SATAN IN ZECHARIAH.

Scholars are now generally in agreement that the Book of Zechariah is not a unity. It seems quite clearly to fall into two distinct halves, chapters I-VIII being the work of one writer, probably Zechariah himself: chapters IX-XIV are the work of some other writer, who appears to have lived at a later period. The earlier chapters are manifestly post-exilic, and seem to have been written during the reign of Darius the Great. It is in this section that the references to Satan are found.

The third chapter opens with a description of Zechariah's fourth vision. Joshua, the high priest, appears in filthy clothing, standing before the angel of the Lord. The whole incident is recorded with very little detail, and no particulars are given of the offences of which the high priest was accused. The Satan stands there to prosecute, but he is not permitted to fulfil his function. The Lord checks him, saying:-"The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; yea, the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?"

In this vision, the Satan appears in almost the same light

that he did in Job. A little development may be indicated by the suggestion that he had not only to test, but also to accuse. This second meaning, however, is implicit in the basic connotation of the word שָׂטָן . The powers of the ~~Satan~~ are entirely in the hands of the Lord, a limitation which also appears in Job. Satan is still an official, rather than a person: the word still has the definite article, even when it is used as a vocative ---- "The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan (שָׂטָן)".

The interpretation has been given that it is some earthly opposing force which makes its appearance as the "adversary" of Zechariah's vision. Thus some scholars, following Ewald, have equated the Adversary with the Persian Court. More recently the view has been put forward by L. E. Browne that the Adversary of the high priest is to be identified with the Samaritans or with those of the Samaritan party. (Early Judaism, pp 68-69.)

As in Job, so also in Zechariah, Satan appears only in a vision. Again he belongs to the realm of fancy, rather than of fact. In both books the word has the definite article: in neither does Satan appear as the Evil One. Nothing approaching a dualism between God and Satan has as yet made its appearance; the Satan is still nothing more than an official appointed by God, whose duties are directed by God.

SATAN IN CHRONICLES.

"And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to

number Israel." (I. Chronicles, XXI. 1.) Old Testament scholars in general have held that in this passage there is a use of the word 'Satan' in reference to a distinct superhuman personality. If this is correct, then we are provided with a most important development in the evolution of the idea of a personal Devil. For this will be the sole occasion in the Old Testament on which Satan - a superhuman adversary - is mentioned as a figure, not of the imagination as in Job and Zechariah, but of history. There is yet another most important development. In the Hebrew original of this Chronicles passage the word 'Satan' lacks the definite article: here at last, if the common interpretation is accepted, we meet with a person, and not the official mentioned in Job and Zechariah.

In II. Samuel, XXIV there is narrated the story of David's numbering of the people. Written in a period when every happening could ultimately be traced back to God, the story begins as follows:- "Again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them, saying, Go, number Israel and Judah." David takes his census, and is duly punished for his offence. To be more correct, it was the people of Israel and Judah who were punished for the offence of their king.

This story is repeated in I. Chronicles, XXI, but in the opening verse there has been made one very significant

alteration. "And Satan stood up against Israel, and moved David to number Israel." The later historian has felt that the narrative of II. Samuel reveals an apparent inconsistency in the actions of the Lord. He therefore frees him from the responsibility of having caused Israel - in the person of David - to sin; the fault is laid to the account of Satan. Who is this Satan? The common interpretation is that here there is a reference to that personification of supreme evil that men were subsequently to term the Devil.

Now the Books of Chronicles are universally regarded as having been written at a very late date. Various references point to this conclusion - notably the fact that a calculation is made in Darics, a Persian coinage first introduced by Darius I. The Books belong to the Persian period, and should be dated between 300 and 250 B.C. The manner in which the earlier material has been handled reflects the influence of the Persian-imbued spirit of post-Exilic Judaism. These Persian influences manifest themselves in a transformed philosophical attitude of the Jews. Briefly, for this must be discussed in a later chapter, the main characteristic of the philosophy of Persian religion was a dualism between Good and Evil, Light and Darkness, etc. If, in the story of the numbering of the people, God is to be absolved of any charge of inconsistency, then only some sort of dualism can absolve him. The supreme power of evil is introduced. The guilt

is taken away from God. But it should be noted that this cannot be the Satan of Job and Zechariah; for this latter was merely an angel who performed the instructions of God. No, if the guilt is to be taken away from God, then there must be substituted some agent performing the instructions of some power other than God. The substitution of Satan does not absolve God, if God is held to be responsible for the actions of this Satan.

As we have already mentioned, the word 'Satan' is without the definite article in the original Hebrew. The LXX also has no definite article: but Luther, strangely enough, has "Und der Satan stand." Satan, in the Hebrew, is no longer a remote official: he is an intimate individual. This also is a very late conception of the Devil; and only the late date of Chronicles and the strong possibility of Persian influences can render this interpretation at all tenable.

While investigating this omission of the definite article, attention may be drawn to the fact that, in Hebrew, there are several instances in which what were originally appellatives have completely assumed the character of real proper names. Gesenius-Kautzsch (trans. Cowley, Oxford, 1910), section 125, remark f, make special mention of

אִישׁ הַשָּׂטָן - the man - later becoming אִישׁ הַשָּׂטָן, the proper name

Adam. Also of אֱלֹהֵי - the god - becoming אֱלֹהִים - God. Along with these examples, a reference is made to the use of יָצָא without the definite article in I. Chronicles, XXI.

There is, however, another possible solution of this problem. The writer may merely have been wishing to suggest that it was an ordinary earthly adversary' who caused David to number the people. The presence of an enemy on the borders has often been known to cause an apprehensive monarch to take a census of his subjects; to see what are his assets in the way of potential warriors. Even in more recent days we have seen how the rapid arming of a hostile nation can cause neighbouring countries to introduce a National Register. In this way 'an adversary' could be taken as referring to some alien foe.

Again, some person who knew David may have suggested this step. He may have been one of David's friends; he may have done it as a perfectly friendly gesture. Yet, viewing his action in the light of its dire results to the nation, the man who first suggested the census was indeed 'an adversary.' And Hebrew writers do tend rather to look to the consequences of an action. As an example of this we may mention the coverlet which played so prominent a part in the murder of Ben-hadad (II. Kings, VIII. 15.).

Parkhurst "Hebrew Lexicon", London 1823, page 694, says, 'And so I would understand it (יָצָא) I. CHRON. XXI of a human foe.'

It was merely an ordinary coverlet, but in the original Hebrew the word is given the definite article, because later generations were to regard it as being 'that notorious coverlet.' Compare also Isaiah VII. 14 - 'Behold, a virgin shall conceive' where the original Hebrew has 'the maiden shall conceive.' The definite article is added because, in the light of later events, the person referred to does become important and, therefore, particular.

It is, perhaps, extravagant to suggest that David may have been induced to take this step by one of the sons of Zeruah. But it is worth while noting that in II. Samuel, XIX, 22, David does say to the sons of Zeruah that they had become 'satans' unto him.

These alternative interpretations of the word 'Satan' as used in Chronicles should ever be borne in mind. The general meaning assigned - i.e. the Devil - is hardly in keeping with the ideas of the Old Testament as a whole; the conception accords better with the teaching of the Apocalyptic writers. On the other hand, the fact of Chronicles being so late, belonging to a period when Persian influences were at work, still renders the common interpretation perfectly feasible.

With this out investigation of the use of the word 'Satan' in the Old Testament must draw to an end. It has, from some aspects, been but a superficial investigation: but it has been

sufficiently exhaustive to demonstrate that no attempt was made to personify evil before the Exile. Even those post-Exilic personifications which do occur in the Books of Job and Zechariah are merely allegorical; and here the Satan is always the official, and never the person. The single reference to a personal Satan is in a historical book which reflects a very late date and Persian influences. There is also the question to be debated as to whether the reference here is not to some human adversary.

The Old Testament Satan is but an Adversary employed by God. Nowhere in the Old Testament is the Dictionary definition to be substantiated, for here most certainly Satan is not "the supreme spirit of evil, the tempter and spiritual enemy of mankind, the foe of God and holiness."
PROFESSOR TORCZYNER'S THEORY.

In the issue of the 'Expository Times' dated September, 1937, Professor Harry Torczyner put forward a new theory regarding the origin of the Satan-conception. Starting his investigations from the Book of Job, he finds a parallel in the incident of the golden candlestick of Zechariah IV. This candlestick contains seven candles, which are the 'eyes' of the Lord that rove ($\square \cdot \text{שׁוֹפָרִים}$) through the whole earth.

It is now suggested that these 'eyes' are not the organs of vision, but rather the Lord's confidants, hence the use of

the masculine gender. This suggestion is based on the Greek analogy that in Herodotus I. 114. ὀφθαλμὸς βασιλῆος is used of a Persian officer (vide Powell, Lexicon to Herodotus.). A parallel is noted in II. Chronicles, XVI. 9 --- 'for the eyes of the Lord rove through the entire earth.'

Professor Torczyner finds the setting of this Zechariah incident very similar to that of the prologue of Job. In both there is an appearance before the Lord as king: in both some officials stand by the Lord - 'the sons of Gods' in Job, 'the sons of Yitzhar' in Zechariah. Amongst the former appears Satan who comes 'from roving (mishshut) in the earth, and from walking in it.'

This is the origin of Satan. "There is no doubt that the original Hebrew name of this 'rover' was not Satan with an S, but -- as these letters can also be pronounced -- Ha-shatan with an Sh, namely, 'the rover.'"

The Shatan is the Lord's eye who goes to and fro in the earth and gives account of the political loyalty of the Lord's subjects. He is not an accuser; and "it is also understood now why Satan does not appear at the end of the story of Job to be punished for his false accusation."

A philological explanation is now given regarding the change of consonants. Shin and Sin are shown to be interchangeable in the Semitic languages, various examples being cited.

Seeing that one of Satan's tasks was to report on the evil deeds of men, there came into existence a new verb, $\gamma\psi\psi$, meaning to accuse or to oppose. This we find in Numbers and elsewhere until we finally have the famous instance of I. Chronicles, XXI. "In short, the origin of ^aSatan as a secret police agent clearly explains his later development."

Regarding the ingenuity of this theory there can be no doubt: but it also appears to possess several serious weaknesses.

(1). Is it justifiable to take a single example from one Greek historian as furnishing a satisfactory explanation of a Hebrew word? Can so much be read into a change of gender?

(2). The Books of Job and Zechariah are manifestly late, post-Exilic writings. But according to Professor Torczyner it was the figure of Satan in these books which ultimately gave rise to the new verb $\gamma\psi\psi$, meaning to oppose. How then are we to explain the phenomenon that this so-called new verb appears, for the most part, in pre-Exilic literature?

(3). If the idea of Satan - or Shatan - is so very primitive, why does it not emerge in early writings?

(4). Are not such figments of the imagination ---

heavenly beings and the like --- generally to be regarded as later refinements? Is there not much truth underlying the old Talmudic saying: "The angels came up with the Jews from Babylon?"

In view of these difficulties, it would seem as though the old theory were the more tenable. The better interpretation of the phenomena is to see an ordinary verb existing, meaning nothing more than to oppose, and from this to advance to a noun which can later take the definite article, denoting an official whose duty it is to oppose men with a view to testing their worth.

CHAPTER III.

EVIL IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The general attitude of the Old Testament writers towards evil is that it is ultimately to be traced back to God. The words of Amos reveal this idea:- "Shall the trumpet be blown in the city, and the people not be afraid? Shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord x hath not done it?" (Amos III.6.) Israelite religion was as yet in so primitive a state that the origin and the existence of moral evil had not become a pressing problem of religious thought. The logical corollaries of the doctrine of Divine unity and omnipotence had not as yet been fully realised.

Before the full monotheism of Yahweh had become a postulate of belief, men had been able to say that some evil was due to the working of some other god. Thus one of the writers of the Book of Kings ascribes the fact that Israel was unable to defeat Moab to the action of Mesha' in offering his son to Chemosh "for a burnt offering upon the wall." (II. Kings, III. 27.)

But with the establishment of a firm belief in monotheism, this solution no longer offered itself. The position generally adopted was that of the Deutero-Isaiah:- "I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things." (Isaiah, XLV, 7.) Not only was material evil traced to Yahweh as the expression of his just wrath against sin, but 'morally pernicious acts were quite frankly ascribed to the direct agency of God.' (Schultz, Old Testament Theology, II. p.270.) It is God who hardens the heart of Pharaoh and the Canaanites: it is God who sends the evil spirit upon Saul, instigating him to make an attempt upon the life of David. As has been mentioned in the previous chapter, it was the Lord, according to the Book of Samuel, who persuaded David to number the people. The Divine origin of moral evil implied in these passages is definitely stated in the Book of Proverbs:- "The Lord hath made everything for its own end: yea, even the wicked for the day of evil." (Proverbs, XVI. 4, Revised Version.) A similar

interpretation is met with in the Lamentations of Jeremiah:- "Out of the mouth of the Most High cometh there not evil and good?" (Lam. III, 38.)

The story of Micaiah's vision illustrates well this attitude towards the origin of evil. Ahab, the king of Israel, sends for a prophet, Micaiah the son of Imlah, who tells the king of his visions. In one of these, he narrates, he saw the Lord sitting on his throne; he heard him ask, 'Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead?' A spirit offers to go, promising to be a 'lying spirit' in the mouth of all of Ahab's prophets. The Lord replied: "Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also: go forth, and do so." (I. Kings, XXII, 20.)

Here it is worthy of note that the writer, although he is telling of a vision only, regards Ahab's prophets as being inspired by a spirit from Yahweh, in spite of it being a lying spirit. Professor Barnes makes the following comment:- "This is in accordance with the teaching of many passages of the Old Testament that both good and evil proceed from the Lord, and that he sometimes permits means that are morally evil to be used for the punishment of evil men." ("Kings", Cambridge Bible.)

So long as ideas of God which were coloured by a crude anthropomorphism were held by his worshippers, God

himself could, and did, bring misfortunes upon men. In time, however, ideas of transcendence began to be superimposed upon those of immanence; a less anthropomorphic view of God came into vogue. Intermediaries came into existence in men's minds: and the angels of God were born. This explains why there was a heavenly council meeting, as mentioned in Job. At an earlier period God would not have been thought to have taken the advice of others in any matter whatever. He would have determined the trials of Job: he himself would have inflicted these trials. As it is, we are dealing with a much later period. God deposes the task to an intermediary, the Adversary. And although sickness and all other misfortunes, even death itself, seem to be due to the working of this Adversary, they are all ultimately to be traced back to God, whose agent the Adversary is.

The ultra-Calvinism, as it has been called, of the earlier Israelite religion was tenable only so long as its full significance remained uncomprehended. It was necessary, as a protest against polytheism and, later, dualism, that the absolute sovereignty of God should be emphatically stressed. For practical purposes men's faith needed to be protected by the assurance that God worked out his purposes in and through human wickedness. Thus it may be affirmed that the earlier attitude of the Old Testament towards moral

evil had a distinct practical and theological value.

But not for ever could the conscience of Israel feel at peace with such a view of the origin of evil. In time ethical standards came to be raised, and the obligations of morality became more imperative; just as men shrank from causing evil themselves and from the use of deceit and violence, so did they hesitate to ascribe to Yahweh what they themselves had come to abhor. Not that any easy solution of the problem seemed to present itself. The urge to do wrong was ever present; it was the punishment of the sinner, the discipline of the saint. That sin had its place in God's government of the world could not be denied; yet in view of men's growing reverence and moral sensitiveness, it was becoming equally impossible to admit without qualification or explanation that God was himself the author of evil. "Jewish thought found itself face to face with the dilemma against which the human intellect vainly beats its wings, like a bird against the bars of its cage". (Bennett, 'Chronicles', Expositor's Bible, page 289.)

It has sometimes been suggested that dualism found a place in the minds of the Israelites through their contacts with Babylon. With reference to this suggestion it should first be noted that it is hardly likely that Babylonian ideas would have influenced the beliefs of the Israelites before the Exile. The language obstacle was too great; for even

as late as the reign of Hezekiah the people in general were unacquainted with Aramain.

With the Exile a great change took place. Aramaic became the ⁿlingua franca of the Jews; and Babylonian ideas must have been assimilated by them to a certain extent. But did this involve the adoption of dualistic views? Was the religion of Babylon based on a dualism? The findings of modern scholars have tended to furnish negative answers to these questions. There were evil spirits and demons in the Babylonian mythology; but, as Professor Langdon has said, "it is clear that the Sumerians and Babylonians believed these evil spirits to belong to their divine order; they have no place for dualism in their system. In late Judaism and in early Christianity the belief in Satan, incarnation of all the demons of a long past Semitic mythology as a being of independent creation, according to modern scholars, is one entirely due to Persian influence.....It should be noted, however, that Satan as the enemy of God and as the Anti-Christ in the new theology of Christianity is not new. The demons of Babylonian mythology also oppose 'god and king.' They are said to be enemies of all the gods, although the texts repeatedly state that they were created by Anu, father of all the gods. For this tolerance of the gods, their creation of evil beings, and their permission to let them pursue their nefarious warfare

against man and beast, plain and hills, trees and plants, the Sumerians had an explanation entirely consistent with monism. The demons are the scourges of the gods, and no man can suffer at their hands if he ensures himself properly by divine protection. And when he is the victim of the demons, the gods in their mercy provide the consecrated priests with divine power to drive them back to their tenebrous abodes."(Semitic Mythology, pp. 373-374.)

Those tendencies towards dualism which later Judaism came to acquire were derived, as we shall see, from contact with Persia rather than with Babylon. This manifests itself most clearly in the writings of the Apocalyptic period, and it is also to be seen in the Talmudic literature. But in many ways it could hardly be called a direct influence. "During a great part of the Persian period the relations between Israel in Palestine and the satraps were not such as to predispose the former to become the conscious imitator of Persia. Indirectly Persia must have influenced the Jews throughout her vast empire, but directly not so much the Jews in Palestine as the large Israelitish colonies on the east of the Euphrates and the Tigris, which, however, must have transmitted the results to the Jews in Palestine." (Cheyne, "The Origin of the Psalter," pp. 281-282.)

CHAPTER IV.

SATAN IN THE APOCRYPHA.

Perhaps some slight apology is required for incorporating a study of the teaching of the Apocrypha into what is in reality an investigation into the personification of supreme evil in Christian thought. Such an apology is rendered necessary through the fact that the Protestant Churches have tended to relegate this literature to a position of secondary importance. Thus the Church of England, in its Sixth Article, stresses that the Hebrew Canon includes no Apocryphal Books; and that these must not be used for establishing doctrine. These "the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners." Again, the Westminster Confession enjoins that these books are not "to be otherwise approved of or made use of than other human writings." In his translation of the Bible, Luther passes the following verdict on the Apocrypha:- "Das sind Bücher, so der heiligen Schrift nicht gleich gehalten, und doch nützlich und gut zu lesen sind."

On the other hand, the Church of Rome decided that all the books of the Apocrypha -- at the Council of Trent -- are canonical and may be used for the establishing of doctrines, apart from three books which were excluded, viz: I. and II.

Esdras', and the Prayer of Manasses. Nor does this attitude lack justification, for it must be remembered that the LXX was the Bible of the Early Church. During the first two centuries all the books in the Greek Canon were regarded as Scripture. Several of the New Testament books manifest the influence of the thought of the Apocrypha. It was quoted as Scripture by the Early Fathers. The Epistles of Clement contain a quotation from Wisdom, and make a reference to Judith. The Epistle of Barnabas employs both II. Esdras and Wisdom. Clement of Rome, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, all accepted the books of the Apocrypha as Scripture. And the last two to be mentioned give quotations from almost every book. In such an investigation as this the Apocrypha cannot be passed over; for, as Charles says, "the modern student recognizes that without them it is absolutely impossible to explain the course of religious development between 200 B.C. and A.D. 100." (Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha to the Old Testament, Vol. I. p.x.)

In view of these facts, no further apology will be needed for giving a review of the teaching of these books. Not that they have many innovations to make towards a doctrine of

¹ Oesterley (An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha, 1935) seems to suggest that I. Esdras was regarded as being canonical. "At the Council of Trent, in 1546, all the books of the Apocrypha, with two exceptions, were pronounced canonical; the exceptions were II. Esdras and the Prayer of Manasses" (p.128.)

a personal Devil. The word 'Satan' occurs once (Ecclus. XXI,27), while σατανος appears only twice (Wis. II,24, I. Macc. I,36), referring, as we hope to prove, on both occasions to an ordinary natural foe. Some books contain nothing which has any bearing on the doctrine of evil; amongst these may be mentioned Judith, the History of Susannah, and the Prayer of Manasses. Other books are of more importance, and must now be examined in detail. These are Ecclesiasticus, the Book of Tobit, the Wisdom of Solomon, I.Maccabees, the Book of Baruch, and II.Esdras.

ECCLESIASTICUS.

The writer of this book approaches the problem of evil along psychological lines. He attacks violently those of his contemporaries who still adhered to the pre-Exilic conception that God was the direct author of evil. "Say not thou, It is through the Lord that I fell away, for thou shalt not do the things he hateth. Say not thou, It is he that caused me to err, for he hath no need of a sinful man." (XV. 11,12.). No, the origin of evil is not to be imputed to God, but to man's own 'evil imagination.'

This closely approximates to the Fall-theory of the Rabbis, in which sin is held to be due to that 'evil tendency'

' Here the original Hebrew suggests that God is the subject of both clauses-----"for he did not make that which he hates." See the comment of Levi----"G. n'a pas compris ce verset, car il dit: 'Ne fait pas,' alors que Dieu est sûrement sujet."

or 'evil imagination' (עליונות) present in all men. The theory is based on the interpretation of a single verse in the Old Testament:- "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination (עליונות) of the thoughts of his heart was only evil (עליונות) continually" (Genesis VI.5.).

So long as our authority for the words of Ben-Sirach was the Greek text of the LXX, it was not altogether certain that the 'evil imagination' was indicated. But now that some portions of the original Hebrew text have been discovered, no doubt exists any longer. Thus, in the passage, "God created man from the beginning, and placed him in the hand of his own counsel. If thou so desirest, thou canst keep the commandment, and it is wisdom to do his good pleasure" (XV.14,15.) for the words 'in the hand of his own counsel' the Hebrew text reads עַל יְדוֹתָיו --- translated by Levi (L'ecclésiastique, Vol. II.p.110) as "Et l'a livré au pouvoir de son penchant." From this it is clear that, in the opinion of Ben-Sirach, man has been given free-will, and it rests with him to follow either the evil inclination, or the good.

Another important passage (XXVII.5,6.) may be rendered from the original Hebrew as follows:- "The vessel of the potter (כְּסֵל) is for the fire to test, and in a similar way a man (is tested) in accordance with his thoughts. According

to the husbandry of a tree will be its fruit, so the thought is in accordance with the inclination (79י) of man." (vide the Hebrew text given by Smend --- "die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach", page 23 --- and adopting the textual emendations suggested by him, viz. to read 7חבב for 7צבב, and 7חבב for 7חבב.) Here it should be noted that the writer is playing upon the words 79י and 79י; the Great Potter himself formed man from the dust, even that part known to religious philosophers as the 'imagination,' the 79י.

In these passages we have seen manifested a slight psychological dualism; a somewhat Pelagian attitude toward sin which seems to have satisfied the writer. But it is much to be questioned whether he would have felt so satisfied with his theory had he traced further back the origin of the 'evil imagination.' For God created man; the 'evil imagination' is part of man; therefore God must have created the 'evil imagination.' From this syllogism we can arrive, in a perfectly logical manner, at the proposition that God was - indirectly or directly - responsible for moral evil; which invalidates that premise already given in the words - quoted above - "Say not thou, It is through the Lord that I fell away."

But at times, so it seems, the writer was not too

happy about the origin of this 'evil imagination.' "O wicked imagination, whence camest thou rolling in to cover the dry land with deceitfulness?" (XXXVII.3.) He finds dualism almost unavoidable -----"Good is set against evil, and life against death; so is the godly against the sinner, and the sinner against the godly"(XXXIII.14).

Now if the source of all evil is to be equated with the 'evil imagination' dwelling in every man, what is the position of the Devil? Either he cannot exist as a supreme power of evil: or he must be identified with the 'evil imagination.' It is the latter solution which is adopted by the writer --- "When the ungodly curseth Satan, he curseth his own soul" (XXI.27.). (Here it should be noted that the word 'Satan' has the definite article; i.e. he is still impersonal, the official of Job and Zechariah.) Scholars in general have accepted the interpretation that Satan and the 'evil imagination' are here identified, although Toy has objected that this view should not be held on the grounds that it would be 'a conception foreign to the whole pre-Christian time as well as to the New Testament.' This objection need not possess very great weight, for in view of Ben-Sirach's general attitude towards the ideas of angels and spirits, his attempted rationalisation of Satan into the 'evil imagination' seems to be highly probable.

Again, this objection is based on an argument from silence, and it cannot be refuted better than by some words from N.P.Williams' "The Fall and Original Sin" (p.64.): - "It is true that after its first occurrence in the Book of Ecclesiasticus the term *yecer* disappears until the beginning of the Talmudic epoch. This, however, is due to the fact that most of the Jewish literature of the last two centuries before and the first century after the birth of Christ is only preserved in Latin, Greek, Ethiopic (SIC), or other non-Semitic languages; and as, at the moment that Hebrew texts become available once more, the idea of the *yecer* is found existing in full force, it is safe to assume that it existed during the period for which direct Hebrew or Aramaic evidence is lacking. And it is well known that the Mishnah and the Midrashim contain much material dating from times long anterior to those of their actual codification or composition in their present form. It will, therefore, be permissible to make a cautious use of Rabbinical and Talmudic data for the purpose of articulating and enriching the general picture of the doctrine of the *yecer ha-ra'* which we have constructed on the basis of the Sirach-passages, so as to be in possession of a roughly accurate idea of the degree of development which it had attained in Jewish thought at the beginning of the Christian era."

Some of the schools, if not all, of later Judaism

accepted this identification of Satan with the 'evil imagination.' The following quotation from the Talmud, Baba Bathra, 16a, makes this obvious:- "Resh Lakish said: Satan, the evil prompter, and the Angel of Death are all one. He is called Satan, as it is written, 'And Satan went forth from the presence of the Lord.' He is called the evil prompter: (we know this because) it is written in another place, '(Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart) was only evil continually,' and it is written here (in connection with Satan), 'only upon himself put not forth thine hand.' The same is also the Angel of Death since it says, 'Only spare his life,' which shows that Job's life belonged to him.' (NOTE. This follows the Soncino Translation of the Talmud, where the words ׁ777 79ׁ are regularly rendered by the 'evil prompter.') It is worthy of mention that in the Talmud we also find that the 'evil imagination' was held to have been created by God:- "I created the evil Yetzer; I created for man the law as a means of healing. If ye occupy yourselves with the Law, ye will not fall into the power (of the evil Yetzer)." (Kiddushin, 30b.)

To sum up, we may say that Ben-Sirach is altogether negative in any contribution towards the doctrine of a personification of supreme evil. God is absolved: evil

is due to that 'evil imagination' which is present in the heart of every man: and Satan is identified with this 'evil imagination.' The Satan of Ben-Sirach, as with that of Milton, could well have said:-

The mind is its own place, and in itself
Can make a Heav'n of Hell, a Hell of Heaven.

(Paradise Lost, Book I.)

THE BOOK OF TOBIT.

There are no direct references to Satan in this book, but there is mention made of 'Asmodeus the evil spirit.' Several scholars have thought that this Asmodeus was identical with the Devil, but a close investigation of the facts renders this view untenable. The action of the book is set in Media, and Iranian and Magian influences manifest themselves. To-day most authorities agree in saying that the word Asmodeus is nothing more than the Persian Aēshma-Daēva, one of the seven arch-demons. In Tobit his characteristic attributes are that he is full of sexual lust, and that he is able to kill his rivals. His power is limited: through nothing more than the smoke of the burning heart and liver of the fish he is put to flight. He goes to Egypt, and here the angel binds him.

It should be noted that here we have one great development. Asmodeus is called an evil spirit, but he does not come 'from the Lord' as did that evil spirit which troubled

Saul (I. Samuel, XVI.14.). The English Version is unhappy, since on two occasions it employs the translation 'devil;' but the Greek has nothing more harmful than δαιμόνιον. One factor which may have led some to identify Asmodeus with Satan is the fact that in Chapter III. 8, after the words 'Asmodeus the evil demon,' the Aramaic Version interpolates כִּי מֶלֶךְ הַדִּמּוֹנוֹת - 'the king of the demons' - a reading which also appears in the Münster Hebrew Version. Against this it must be stressed that at his worst Aēshma-Daēva is merely a Persian demon: he is never the Persian god of evil. This office is always reserved for Ahriman (Angra Mainyu.)

When Asmodeus has been overcome by the fumes of the burning heart and liver, we read that "he fled into the utmost parts of Egypt" (VIII.3.). A common interpretation of this was that he fled to the desert, ever regarded in primitive thought as being the favourite habitation of demons. Some (e.g. Hall - 'The Pedigree of the Devil') have gone so far as to suggest that he later became the Satan of the Temptation Story, employing the lusts of appetite and power as his allies. A brilliant suggestion was made by Kohut (Jüd. Angelologie) that the word 'Egypt' looks back to the Hebrew מִצְרַיִם, and that this has been written in error for Mazindaran. This latter was the region of Persia which contained

' Fernand Prat (The Theology of St. Paul, Vol.II, 412) seems inclined to identify the two.

Mount Dimarvand: and here, in the popular myth, the old serpent Azi Dahaka was at last bound captive.

Asmodeus subsequently appeared frequently in the Talmud, also in the Targum of Ecclesiastes. Here his name appears as Asmodai - אַסְמֹדַי, a word which gave rise to an attempted derivation of the name from the Hebrew root אִסַּד, making Asmodai into the Supreme Destroyer. Asmodai makes a similar appearance in the Testament of Solomon (vide the translation of this work in the Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. XI.20). Here he is made to say, 'My business is to plot against the newly-wedded, so that they may not know one another,----- I transport men into fits of madness --- with the result that they commit sin and fall into murderous deeds.' As in Tobit, it is Raphael who can render Asmodeus innocuous by smoke from a fish's gall.

Some scholars have objected to the proposed derivation of Asmodeus from Aēshma-Daēva, on the grounds that the latter was essentially a 'Fiend of Violence,' whereas the Asmodeus of Tobit seems to be more prone to lust than to violence. Armand Kaminka (Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. XIII.) suggested a third interpretation, no less ingenious than fantastic. Stated briefly, his theory is as follows. Asmodeus is to be associated with neither the Persian Aēshma-Daēva, nor the Hebrew אִסַּד: his name is derived from Smerdis. Now this Smerdis is mentioned by Herodotus (Book III. 60ff); in the

' See Moulton (Expository Times, Vol. XI, 1900, pp. 257-260)

absence of Cambyses he takes possession of the Persian throne, due to the close resemblance which he bore to the king's brother. Afterwards it was discovered that he was Smerdis the magician. In later times this Smerdis became a mythical figure, a type of evil Merlin, and was held to be king of the demons. Kaminka points out that Herodotus wrote some three hundred years before the composition of the Book of Tobit, and that during this period the reputation of Smerdis would have grown considerably.

This ingenious interpretation has - perhaps naturally - not found much favour with contemporary scholars. It is interesting to note that Oesterley makes no reference to it in his recent 'Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha.'

It is better that Asmodeus should be identified with Aēshma-Daēva. He is a Persian demon: he is not the Persian Devil.

THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON.

This book, generally dated about 100 B.C., exhibits several developments of the conception of evil. In the first place, the writer is seen to be mildly influenced by some sort of dualism. Material evil does exist, but it is to be traced back to some cause other than God. More especially is this revealed in his attitude towards death: "For God made not death: neither hath he pleasure in the death of the living" (I.13.). "For God created man to be

immortal, and made him to be an image of his own eternity" (II.23.). This dualism, however, is immediate and not absolute; there will come a time when the good will prevail: "After this cometh night: but vice shall not prevail against wisdom" (VI.30.).

In the second place, there are the vast problems raised by that perplexing verse: "Nevertheless, through envy of the devil came death into the world; and they that do hold of his side do find it" (II.24.). Most commentators, including Goodrick,² Deane,³ Holmes, and Harris, have seen in this verse an identification of the Devil with the serpent of the Fall-story. This is most important, being the first occasion in extant literature on which the two are equated, unless the reference in the Slavonic Book of Enoch is regarded as being earlier. This identification is later to be found in the Kabbalah and the Talmud, as well as in the Apocalyptic Literature - (vide Revelation XII. 9....'And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world.').

But the correctness of this exegesis may be questioned. It is death which enters into the world: it is not evil, as would be expected if we had here a reference to the Fall-story. Again, so far as Genesis III is concerned, we are not told that

¹The Book of Wisdom (Rivington) ²The Book of Wisdom (Oxford)
³Article 'Wisdom' in Apocrypha (ed Charles). "Article 'Wisdom' in New Commentary (S.P.C.K.)

the serpent was envious. It was considerations such as these which led Gregg ('Wisdom of Solomon' Cambridge Bible) to abandon any Fall-story interpretation, and to say that the reference is to the murder of Abel by Cain.

This is a perfectly tenable explanation, for, according to Genesis, the murder of Abel was the first appearance of death in human history. There is the difficulty that no mention is made of the 'envy of the devil' in Genesis, but Gregg attempts to surmount this by drawing attention to the fact the Theophilus (ad Autol. II.29.) writes:- "When, then, Satan saw Adam and his wife not only still living, but also begetting children - being carried away with spite because he had not succeeded in putting them to death, - when he saw that Abel was well-pleasing to God, he wrought upon the heart of his brother called Cain, and caused him to kill his brother Abel. And thus did death get a beginning in this world, to find its way into every race of man, even to this day." A somewhat similar explanation is to be found in the writings of Clement of Rome (ad Cor. III.).

Commentators, however, have not noted that the English Version is hardly correct in its translation of the Greek original - φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον - 'But by envy of the devil death entered into the world.' Yet, in the Greek, no definite article is to be found with the word 'devil.' A far more accurate translation would be:-

"But by envy of an enemy death entered into the world." No longer is any explanation needed to justify the reference to the Devil, for διαβόλου refers to Cain. He, it cannot be denied, was Abel's enemy; and his sin was due to envy.

It may be objected that the true meaning of διάβολος is 'slanderer.' This objection does not hold good as regards the Greek of the LXX. The Hebrew word SATAN (שָׂטָן) is often used in the Old Testament of an adversary, either earthly or angelic; here the LXX generally has διάβολος, διαβάλλειν, or some periphrasis employing the word διαβολή. And in I. Maccabees I, 36. (καὶ εἰς διάβολον ποιηρὸν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ) the word is used of a definite hostile locality. On this point Hatch (Essays in Biblical Greek, pp. 45-47.) remarks, "It seems to be clear that the LXX used διάβολος and its paronyms with the general connotation of enmity, and without implying accusation whether true or false."

The absence of the definite article has been passed over in most of the commentaries, but Goodrick quotes Acts XIII.10 (οὗτος διαβόλου) as another example of this omission. Against this it may well be asked whether Paul was referring here to the Devil, or to a devil or a slanderer. (And is it certain that Paul ever does use διάβολος of the Devil? Does he not generally use the word 'Satan'?) In the New

Testament, when meaning the supreme power of evil, the word διάβολος almost always has the definite article. The same may be said of SATAN (שָׂטָן) in the Old Testament, apart from I.Chronicles XXI.1., and even here, as we have seen, there is considerable doubt as to whether Satan or an earthly adversary is indicated.

It might also be asked why, if Cain is the object of this reference, the writer did not mention him by name. The answer to this is not difficult to seek. It is characteristic of the writer of Wisdom to avoid proper names. In Chapter IV.10 he does not mention Enoch by name, nor the men of Sodom in XIX.14. On this strange characteristic see Goodrick op. cit. pages 143 and 371.

One further suggestion must be made. The absence of the definite article might indicate that death was due to the envy of one of several devils. This is not an altogether untenable explanation, for numerous Devils or ^aStans are mentioned in the Apocalyptic literature. But it would not harmonise so well with the rest of the verse as would a reference either to the Devil or to Cain.

I. MACCABEES.

From the nature of this study, it is only a single passage in I. Maccabees which need be investigated. In Chapter

I. we meet with a section (verses 29-36) dealing with the occupation of Jerusalem by Apollonius, 'the chief collector of taxes' of Antiochus. He ravaged the city and slaughtered its inhabitants. "And they led captive the women and the children, and took possession of the cattle. And they fortified the city of David with a great and strong wall with strong towers, so that it was made into a citadel for them. And they placed there a sinful nation, lawless men; and they strengthened themselves therein. And they stored up there arms and provisions, and collecting the spoils of Jerusalem, they laid them up there. And it became a sore menace, for it was a place to lie in wait in against the sanctuary, and an evil adversary to Israel continually." Here the LXX reads: καὶ εἰς διάβολον πονηρὸν πρὸς Ἰσραὴλ διὰ παντός.

The importance of this passage is obvious, for here is a use of διάβολος - one of the two appearances of the word in the entire Apocrypha - with reference to an inanimate object, viz: a locality. Here it cannot possibly have its Classical meaning of 'slanderer,' an important development from the standpoint of those who would investigate the true meaning of the word in the New Testament. And no reference to the Devil can be deduced, however far the exegetical imagination may be stretched.

That I. Maccabees was originally written, not in Greek, but in a Semitic language, is universally accepted. In spite of the suggestion of Jerome in his Prologus Galeatus ("Machabeorum primum librum hebraicum repperi"), scholars have debated as to whether the original language was Hebrew or Aramaic. The common conclusion at which they have arrived is that the book was translated from a Hebrew original. This is presupposed by the presence of both manifest translations and equally manifest mis-translations. Yet another reason has been advanced by scholars, well-stated by Oesterley:- "Hebrew, rather than Aramaic, would be the natural language to be employed for a literary purpose by a Palestinian Jew, especially in this case, where the writer's intention was to follow the pattern of the Old Testament Historical books". (Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha, page 300.).

In view of this, we are entitled to ask what would be the word in the original Hebrew represented by the Greek ἀνίστολος . It is most likely that אֲנִישׁ would be found, still used in its early sense of 'adversary.' There is, however, this one development, viz:- in previous instances the adversary has always been either an individual or an angel; now it is a locality.

It might be objected that 'Satan' must by now have lost its primitive meaning of adversary; that it must always by this period indicate a supernatural being. This argument may easily be refuted by pointing out that even in Gospel times our Lord addressed St. Peter as 'Satan.'

The absence of the definite article with διάβολος would seem to postulate a similar absence in the Hebrew original. When used of an earthly adversary, these words still do not take the article. This may throw a little more light upon the problem of the omission of the article in I. Chronicles, XXI.1.

The possibility does of course exist that in the original Hebrew the word may have been 79. Not that the chances are extremely likely, because 79 is not represented by διάβολος except in Esther, the LXX normally rendering the word by ὑπεναντίας, ἐχθρός, or the participle of θάλω. This hypothesis, if accepted, would not rob this passage of its importance. We should still be left with the arresting phenomenon of the word διάβολος being employed in a sense, not of slanderer, but of foe or opposer; and of it referring, not to an individual, but to an inanimate object.

It cannot be denied that the word has undergone a change from its original Classical meaning. But now a

further problem presents itself. Has the word, in~~x~~ itself, an altogether evil connotation? Does it mean adversary, or an evil adversary? The fact that in this passage the writer has thought it necessary to qualify the expression by means of the epithet *πονηρός* makes the former suggestion a distinct possibility. But only a study of the New Testament will enable us to reach anything in the nature of a solution.

THE BOOK OF BARUCH.

On account of what seems to be a clear reference to the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, the writing of this book has been assigned to a late date. ¹Whitehouse, ²Schurer, and ³Rothstein agree in placing it between 70 - 78 A.D. Seeing, then, that the book is so late, it is somewhat surprising to find that the doctrine of evil which it reflects is of a very primitive nature, closely approximating to that of pre-Exilic Judaism. Apocalyptic elements are entirely lacking; nor are there represented the tenets of contemporary Rabbinic teaching. There is but one reference to demons:- "For fire shall come upon her from the Everlasting, long to endure; and she shall be inhabited of demons for a long time" (IV.35.). And even this, according to Whitehouse, is a feature borrowed from Isaiah XIII. 21 and Jeremiah LI. 37.

¹ "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha" ed. Charles Vol.I. 569-595.

² "Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes" III. 338-344.

³ "Die Apocryphen des A.T." ed. Kautzsch, Vol.I. 213-225.

In this book there is manifested that simple conception of pre-Exilic Judaism which held that God himself was ultimately responsible for evil. "For all these plagues are come upon us, which the Lord hath pronounced against us" (II.7.). Wherefore the Lord watched over us for evil, and the Lord hath brought it upon us"(II. 9.). A religious philosophy such as this must perforce leave no room for any personification of the supreme power of evil. It is hard to conjecture what place the Devil or Satan could occupy in such a system. But it is interesting to note that so primitive a philosophy did actually exist at such a late date.

II. ESDRAS.

In view of its being included in the Apocrypha, this book must be studied in the present section. But its late date and apocalyptic character indicate that it should more rightly be treated along with the pseudepigraphical literature. Not found in the LXX, it is of a composite nature, its several sections having been written at various dates during the wide period 65 - 260 A.D. Written originally in Hebrew, the book is known variously as II. Esdras or IV. Ezra, and derives its English title from the Vulgate Version, where the first verse reads: "Liber Esdrae prophetae secundus." In the Vulgate, however, its title is given as "Liber Quartus Esdrae."

Amongst the elements which go to make up this book

there may be seen traces of both Christian and Rabbinic writings. Its whole tendency is apocalyptic. Taking into account the date and nature of II. Esdras, it is surprising to meet with no references to the Devil. Such dualism that it does contain is of an entirely psychological nature. Evil, as with Ben-Sirach and the Rabbinical writers, is not visualised as being some force or person external to man. Rather is it relegated to an inward domain, that 'evil imagination' (שׁוֹמְרוֹת הַלֵּב) present in each human soul. At the same time, it must be observed that II. Esdras does not accept that other doctrine which Rabbinic writers always associate with the theory of the 'evil imagination', viz:- that the antidote, or, rather, the prophylactic, against the attacks of the 'evil imagination' is the due observance of the Law. "For the first Adam, bearing a wicked heart (*cor malignum*) transgressed and was overcome; and not he only, but all they also that are born of him. Thus disease was made permanent; and the law was in the heart of the people along with the wickedness of the root (*cum malignitate radicis*); so the good departed away, and that which was wicked remained." (III. 21-22).

The personal experience of the writers militated against that optimistic theory that the mere observance

of the Law could render a man immune. They accordingly modified their theory by introducing elements from the teaching of current apocalyptic writings, indicating that the 'evil imagination' has now become hereditarily inherent in the human race. The 'cor malignum' was in the heart of Adam, and as such was transmitted to all his progeny. "For a grain of evil seed was sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning, and how much wickedness hath it brought forth unto this time! and how much shall it yet bring forth until the time of threshing come!" (IV. 30.) "Then said he unto me, Even so is Israel's portion. Because for their sakes I made the world: and when Adam transgressed my statutes, then was decreed that now is done. Then were the entrances of this world made narrow, and sorrowful and toilsome: they are but few and evil, full of perils, and charged with great toils." (VII. 10 - 12.)

Thus ends our survey of the Books of the Apocrypha. There have been no great developments to observe: we are little nearer the conception of a personal Devil than we were when studying the pages of the Old Testament. What phenomena of any interest have we noted? The emergence of a slight dualism, mainly of a psychological nature. The development of the doctrine of

the 'evil imagination;' and its intimate association with Satan --- this being the single occasion on which the word is used in the Apocrypha. Again, we have observed that in the Greek of this period the word διάβολος could be employed impersonally with reference to a locality. Demons, apart from Asmodeus in Tobit, have been conspicuously absent. The other remaining instance of the use of διάβολος (Wisdom II.24.) has left us in doubt as to its true meaning. We are not certain that we have a reference here to Satan; it may be only some earthly adversary that is indicated.

Yet scholars and readers alike have often felt that there ought to be more references to the Devil and to demons in the Apocrypha. It seems to be a natural tendency in man to multiply demons, a tendency which finds its fullest expression in the period of the Pseudepigrapha. But we search the pages of our Apocrypha, destined to meet with little save the demon of disappointment. There is, however, a strange sentence in Dr. Oesterley's "Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha" which shows that he at least refuses to be disappointed. "The mention of Satan, moreover (Ecclus.XXI. 27.), and the devil (Wisdom II. 24) implies a belief in demons as his army of subordinates." (page 110.)

Let us take the former of these two passages, and

submit it to minute examination. "When the wicked man curseth Satan, he curseth his own soul." But where are the armies of subordinates? There is not even a suggestion of their existence. All we have is manifestly an attempted equation of the 'Tester' or 'Adversary' with the 'evil imagination.'

Perhaps we shall best be able to clarify our thoughts by turning back the pages of Dr. Oesterley's book, and by seeing what he himself has to say about this passage.

Here are his actual words:-

"The words 'his own soul' mean 'himself'; here 'Satan' is synonymous with evil and with the man himself; and taking the two verses together they mean that evil is of man's own making, he is not only responsible for his own sin, but he is himself its seat. In such a case it is not necessary to seek for any other origin of sin." (Page 89.).

Taking these two somewhat contradictory quotations from Dr. Oesterley's book as our premises, there is only one conclusion at which we can logically arrive. Every wicked man possesses an army of subordinate demons!

Now we must investigate the second of the two passages: "Through envy of the devil, death entered into the world." However we interpret this passage, whether of the serpent or of Cain, how can we force into it a reference to an army

of subordinate demons? Such exegesis demands no mere theologian or philologist; he who would produce such a result must also be a wizard.

CHAPTER V.

THE SEPTUAGINT.

At first sight it might seem to be somewhat irrelevant to insert a section on a translation of the Old Testament into an examination of the evolution of the idea of personified evil. But a little reflection will soon serve to show that such a section, far from being irrelevant, is altogether necessary. For, from the very nature of our enquiry, the LXX is of vital importance. It is more than any mere translation of the Old Testament; it is also some sort of an interpretation. Dr. Hatch has stressed this aspect of the LXX in the following words:} "But that which makes the possession of this key (i.e. the right understanding of the meaning of individual words) to its meaning of singular value in the case of the LXX, is the fact that to a considerable extent it is not a literal translation but a Targum or paraphrase." (Essays in Biblical Greek, p.15.).

Already the importance of the LXX has been proved; but what makes it much more important for us is the fact that

it was in process of construction during that very period which saw men's minds moving rapidly towards the conception of a personal Devil. As we shall observe in the following chapter, it was in the Apocalypses and the Pseudepigrapha that the Satan concept burst into bloom; and with this literature the LXX is practically contemporary. It will therefore be our task to investigate the LXX with a view to discovering any renderings which seem to reflect the new attitude towards evil and its personification.

But the LXX is of great importance from another aspect. We are dealing now with what was destined to become the Bible of the Early Church. As such it wielded an influence which it is hard to over-estimate. The New Testament, as is well known, abounds in quotations from the Old Testament; and the majority of these are derived from the LXX. On many occasions the LXX seems to have been preferred, even when it differed from the original Hebrew. Even where there are no quotations, as in the Book of Revelation, we still find that the language is permeated with LXX phraseology to a very large extent. In a similar way we find that the Greek Fathers give frequent quotations from the LXX. We may here reproduce Dr. Swete's appreciation of the great importance of the LXX:-

"No question can arise as to the greatness of the place

occupied by the Alexandrian Version in the religious life of the first six centuries of its history. The Septuagint was the Bible of the Hellenist Jew, not only in Egypt and Palestine, but throughout Western Asia and Europe. It created a language of religion which lent itself readily to the service of Christianity and became one of the most important allies of the Gospel. It provided the Greek-speaking church with an authorised translation of the Old Testament, and when Christian missions advanced beyond the limits of Hellenism, it served as a basis for fresh translations into the vernacular." (Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, p.433.)

Let us investigate how the LXX translators rendered the Hebrew word $\gamma \nu \psi$. Perhaps we should turn first to those passages in which it seems certain that Satan denotes an angelic adversary, viz: Job and Zechariah. Here we find that the word $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ has been uniformly employed; and we may also observe that the verb $\delta\iota\alpha\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$ has been used in earlier passages to translate $\gamma \nu \psi$ when indicating an earthly adversary. It is now our business to study the true meaning of these words $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ and $\delta\iota\alpha\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$, also the abstract noun $\delta\iota\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\eta$, in Classical Greek.

Here the main conception is that of slander; there is normally the implication of slanderous, or at least malicious,

accusation. Sometimes the verb διαβάλλω is found in a probably earlier sense of setting at variance, vide Plato, Republic, Book VI, section 498c ---Μὴ διαβάλλῃς, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἐμὲ καὶ Θρασύμαχον ἄρτι φίλους γαγονότας, οὐδὲ πρὸ τοῦ ἐχθροὺς ὄντας . ('Do not divide, said I, Thrasymachus and me, who are now become friends, nor were we enemies heretofore'.). Again, we may observe a use of the word in the passive, evidently with the force of 'being at variance,' e.g. Thucydides VIII. 83 --- καὶ πρότερον τῷ Τισσαφέρνηι ἀπιστοῦντας πολλῶ δὲ μᾶλλον ἔτι διαβέβληντο . . . A similar use of διαβάλλω as meaning 'to set at variance' will be found in Plato, Symposium, 222. But generally the verb implies an attack on a person's character by means of slander or libel. It has also the meanings of 'to lie,' 'to misrepresent facts,' or 'to deceive by false accounts.'

The same evil meaning underlies the use of διάβολος , whether as an adjective or as a noun. Invariably it seems to have connoted malice; for examples of this we may consult Aristophanes, Knights, 45; and Pindar, Fr. 270. The Atticists, e.g. Pollux, V.18, coordinate λοῖδορος , βλάσφημος, διάβολος . Lucian's treatise, Περὶ τοῦ μὴ ῥαδίως πιστεύειν διαβολῇ , indicates no trace of any other meaning. The abstract noun διαβολή indicates false accusation or slander (vide Herodotus III, 66, 67, Thucydides VIII, 91.,

Euripides, Andromache, 1005, etc.).

From this we can infer that the word employed in the LXX had, at least in Classical Greek, a very bad meaning. As we have seen in earlier chapters, the Hebrew root underlying the word Satan had no such evil meaning. It merely indicated an adversary, something or somebody which opposed a person, or stood in a person's way. In the Hebrew, the Satan of Job and Zechariah was nothing more than an angel who obstructed men with a view to the testing of their motives. Thus we can arrive at the first of our major deductions. So far as the Books of Job and Zechariah are concerned, the Satan of the LXX is a more evil figure than that of the original Hebrew ---- always provided that διάβολος in the LXX bears the same meaning that it possesses in Classical Greek.

But we have good reasons for suspecting that διάβολος has undergone some change of meaning, at least in the translation of certain books. It cannot be denied that it means, on occasions, not so much a slanderer, but rather an enemy or an adversary; a meaning, significantly enough, which the root STN bears in the Hebrew. In proof of this we may advance the evidence provided by two passages in Esther:-

(a). "But if we had been sold for bondmen and bondwomen, I had held my tongue, although the enemy could not

countervail the king's damage." (VII. 4.).

(b). "On that day did the king Ahasuerus give the house of Haman, the king's enemy, unto Esther the queen: and Mordcai came before the king; for Esther had told what he was unto her." (VIII. 1.).

In both these passages the LXX employs the translation δῖβλος ; and that the word here has not its Classical meaning of slanderer is obvious from the two words in the original Hebrew which it represents. These are 79 in the first passage, and 779 in the second, roots of which the essential meaning is ever hostility. Hence we may say that, for the translators of the Book of Esther, the word δῖβλος most certainly had a meaning other than that found in Classical Greek.

The First Book of Maccabees furnishes an even more convincing proof of this point. In Chapter I. there is a section, already dealt with in our study of the Apocrypha, which tells of the spoilation of Jerusalem by Apollonius, how he 'placed there a sinful nation. lawless men..... And it became a sore menace, for it was a place to lie in wait in against the sanctuary, and an evil adversary to Israel continually." (verses 34-36.). The word translated by 'adversary' is δῖβλος , a rare instance of this term being used of a locality. One point arising from this is glaringly

apparent: διάβολος must here have the meaning of 'enemy.' For although it is not difficult to picture a locality as becoming hostile, it is almost impossible to picture it as becoming slanderous. In the Greek text, as we have also previously mentioned, we find that διάβολος is qualified by the addition of the adjective πονηρός. Why should such a qualification be deemed necessary? It might well be suggested that διάβολος could now bear a meaning which was not, of itself, altogether evil. As a parallel to this it might be mentioned that in its earlier appearances, the Hebrew word STN had a meaning which was far from evil, being used, for instance, of the 'angel of God' that opposed Balaam and his ass (Numbers XXII, 22.). And in the New Testament, it must be remembered, our Lord addressed as 'Satan' one who was later to be acclaimed as the founder of the Church of Rome (Mark VIII.33.)

At this juncture the question arises as to whether the words διάβολος, διαβολή, and διαβάλλω, are ever used in the LXX with their Classical meaning. Have we been in the least justified in saying that the Seventy gave the term STN a new and debased content? The answer must be in the affirmative, as can readily be seen from the following passages taken from the Wisdom of Ben-Sirach:-

(a). "Reprove a friend; for many times there is slander (διαβολή): and trust not every word." (XIX.15.)

(b). "Of three things my heart was afraid; and concerning the fourth kind I made supplication: the slander ($\delta\iota\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\gamma$) of a city, and the assembly of a multitude, and a false accusation." (XXVI. 5.).

(c). "For thou wast my protector and helper, and didst deliver my body out of destruction, and out of the snare of a slanderous (διαβολή) tongue, from lips that forge lies."
(LI. 2.).

In all these passages the word $\delta\iota\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\eta'$ has been rendered by its Classical meaning of slander; and a study of the contexts will show that no other translation (i.e. enmity) could be justified. But that this same word does also possess its new meaning in the LXX is to be seen in the Book of Numbers:- "And the angel of the Lord said unto him, Wherefore hast thou smitten thine ass these three times? Behold, I went out to withstand thee ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \delta\iota\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\eta'ν\ σου$), because thy way is perverse before me." (XXII. 32.). When we note that the Hebrew original here reads $\gamma\ \overline{\text{w}}\ \overline{\text{v}}\ \overline{\text{s}}$, we need have no hesitation in asserting that the abstract term $\delta\iota\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\eta'$ is used in the LXX in two senses:- (1) the Classical sense of 'slander.' (2) the new sense of 'hostility' or 'opposition.' The renderings given by the Vulgate tend

to support our theory: for (a), (b), and (c), we find 'commissio,' 'delatura,' and 'lingua iniqua' respectively, while for the Numbers passage there is employed the periphrasis, 'ut adversarer tibi.'

Now the verb διαβάλλω must be examined. It is used in its Classical sense of 'to slander' on two occasions in the Book of Daniel.

(a). "Wherefore at that time certain Chaldeans came near, and accused (διέβαλον) the Jews." (III.8.).

(b). "And the king commanded, and they brought those men which had accused (τοὺς διαβαλόντας) Daniel." (VI.24.).

Here again we can feel no doubt regarding the Classical force of the verb, representing as it does the Aramaic ܕܡܢܢܐ, meaning 'to slander' (literally 'to eat their pieces' vide Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, page 1080.).

But we also meet with the verb in the LXX when it must possess its new meaning of 'to oppose.' Turning again to the story in Numbers of Balaam and his ass, we read: "And God's anger was kindled because he went: and the angel of the Lord stood in the way for an adversary against him." Here in the Hebrew we read ַיִּפְּסֵהוּ, and this is rendered in the LXX by διαβαλεῖν. (This is the reading of the Sixtine Edition of 1587. Codex Alexandrinus reads ἐνδιαβάλλειν, while Codex Vaticanus reads ἐνδιαβαλεῖν.) In this way we

can affirm that the verb διαβάλλω is used in both its Classical and its new senses in the LXX.

When, however, we turn to the noun διάβολος in the LXX we cannot point to any one passage and say that here we have the word used in its Classical sense only. On the other hand, we have already observed many passages in which it can have its new meaning only. About the Job and Zechariah passages we may well feel doubtful. At first sight διάβολος seems to be nothing more than a word denoting 'an opposer'; but later, taking into account the ever-growing Satan-consciousness of the period, also the later interpretations given to the word --- making the Evil One into the father of lies, etc. --- we shall perhaps find it safer to conclude that the word may be used in both these books with a double meaning, i.e. with the sense of both 'enemy' and 'slanderer.'

As we have already demonstrated, it is in Job and Zechariah that the Hebrew term STN is employed, not of an earthly, but of a superhuman and angelic adversary. The presence of the Hebrew definite article has led us to conclude that we have here indicated an official, rather than a person. Now we must investigate the evidence furnished by the LXX, in order that we may determine whether the Seventy took any definite steps towards the further personification of Satan. A study of the LXX Concordance of Hatch and Redpath serves to show that the διάβολος of Job always has the definite

article. The same may be said of Zechariah, with the exception of a single passage -- "The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan"-- in which the word is used in the Vocative Case; had a definite article been found here, it would have been contrary to Greek usage, even the rather lax Greek of the LXX. Thus we may safely assert that, in the LXX, no attempt has been made to personalize the official Satan of Job and Zechariah.

But we do meet with an omission of the definite article with δαίμονες in other passages of the LXX. Thus in I. Maccabees I, 36, where we have the reference to the hostile locality, we note such an omission. Also in Psalm CIX. 6, a passage already investigated, where we have decided to follow - with most modern scholars - the translation of the Revised Version, seeing here a reference to an earthly adversary in the law-courts. A similar omission of the definite article, following the original Hebrew, is to be observed in I. Chronicles, XXI.1. Regarding this passage we have, in an earlier chapter, advanced several arguments for believing that the reference here is to some earthly adversary. But whatever interpretation is placed on the Hebrew, there is no reason for seeing in this an attempt on the part of the Seventy to personalize Satan. They

' vide Oesterley in loc. Psalms, Vol. II. page 459.

have merely been following the Hebrew with slavish accuracy.

One last passage must be mentioned where the word διάβολος appears without the definite article. For this, alas, we have no Hebrew original to which we could make an appeal. The passage in question is the Wisdom of Solomon II. 24 --- "Through envy of the devil, death entered into the world." This we have discussed at length in our section on the Apocrypha, suggesting some reasons for suspecting that διάβολος in this context may refer to some human adversary, such as Cain. Were this, on the other hand, an identification of the serpent with the devil, we should have here the only attempt in the LXX to portray a personal Devil. The position is rendered more complicated by the fact that, in the New Testament, the word διάβολος is almost always accompanied by the definite article.

It should even at this stage be emphasised that the LXX translators did not always represent the Hebrew root STN by διάβολος. In three passages, all significantly occurring in the same book, viz: I Kings (LXX. III. Kingdoms), we find that the word has been transliterated by σατάν. The passages in question are as follows:-

(a). "And the Lord stirred up an adversary (σατάν) unto Solomon, Hadad the Edomite: he was of the king's seed

in Edom." (XI.14.).

(b). "And God stirred him up another adversary (σατάν), Rezon the son of Eliadah, which fled from his lord Hadadezer king of Zobah." (XI. 23, following text of Codex Alexandrinus).

(c). "And he was an adversary (σατάν) to Israel all the days of Solomon." (XI. 25, following Codex Vaticanus.)

The fact that two different renderings were employed in the LXX will be of the greatest importance when we come to investigate the teaching of the New Testament. Here we shall observe that both διάβολος and Σατανᾶς are used. We shall also observe some strange phenomena associated with their use by the different writers. Why does St. Mark never use διάβολος? Why has St. Paul such a preference for Σατανᾶς? Why do St. Matthew and St. Luke substitute διάβολος for the Σατανᾶς of St. Mark? Why does our Lord seem almost invariably to have used Σατανᾶς? Why has the writer of the Book of Revelation to couple the two terms together? It is only after a thorough examination of the LXX that we can attempt to answer such questions; only when it is constantly borne in mind that the Hebrew SATAN was a mild term, and that διάβολος had two different meanings in the LXX, the Bible of the Early Church.

There is yet a third rendering of SATAN to be found in the LXX, viz: ἐπίβουλος. Meaning a plotter or a treacherous person, this word is found in three passages as a trans-

lation for SATAN, the latter term here indicating some ordinary earthly adversary.

(a). "Make this fellow return ---- and let him not go down with us to battle, lest in the battle he be an adversary ($\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$) to us." (I. Samuel, XXIX.4. ---LXX. I.Kingdoms, XXIX.4.).

(b). "And David said, What have I to do with you, ye sons of Zeruiah, that ye should this day be adversaries ($\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$) unto me." (II. Samuel, XIX, 22.).

(c). "But now the Lord my God hath given me rest on every side, so that there is neither adversary ($\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$) nor evil occurrent." (I. Kings, V.4.).

This method of rendering the Hebrew will have little bearing on our New Testament investigations, for the word $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ is not found in these writings. The nearest approach which we find to it is in the occurrence of the term $\epsilon\pi\iota\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta$, meaning a plot, or an ambush. (vide Acts IX. 24, XX. 3, 19. etc.).

Before concluding this examination of the LXX, we must point out that it exhibits a tendency which may be observed in the Apocalyptic and Pseudepigraphic literature. This is the tendency to ascribe to some other source an action which in the Old Testament is ascribed to God, such an action being thought unworthy of him. Thus in the Book of Exodus we read

how God attempted to kill Moses:- "And it came to pass by the way in the inn, that the Lord met him, and sought to kill him." (Exodus, IV. 24.). Here the LXX translators absolve God of what they regarded as being incongruous conduct by ascribing the deed to the 'angel of the Lord.' A similar course is followed by the Rabbinic interpreters, while the Book of Jubilees does not hesitate to lay this action to the charge of Mastema. (XLVIII.2.3.).

Again, the LXX played its own minor part in the evolution of the Myth of the Watchers (see our section on the Ethiopic Book of Enoch.). For example, in Genesis VI. 1., where the original Hebrew reads 'sons of God', the LXX has 'angels of God.' And it was from the LXX translation of Daniel --- where the word ἄγγελοι is employed --- that the writers of the Slavonic Book of Enoch derived their own peculiar expression for the Watchers, viz: Grigori.

CHAPTER VI.

THE APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

INTRODUCTION.

Thus far our researches into the doctrine of evil, as revealed in the writings of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, have not brought us into contact with any doctrine of a personal Devil. It is true that we have found refer-

ences to demons in the Old Testament; and in Job and Zechariah we have met with a creation of men's minds known as the Satan. But he is nothing more, even in these flights of the imagination, than an angel whose task it is to test the worth of men.. He is never a person, but always an official. In the late work of Chronicles we have a single reference to a Satan: but we have seen that there are good reasons for doubting whether this indicates a supernatural adversary. It seems to be more likely that we have here a reference to some earthly adversary.

Equally slight, as has been noted at the conclusion of Chapter IV., were the positive references to any personification of supreme evil in the Apocrypha. The very words Satan and the Devil did not appear more than three times, and of these three occurrences only one can possibly be said to indicate a personal Devil. And even about this one instance we have striven to show that we can feel by no means certain about its Satanic implications.

Such, then, are the negative results which have hitherto been obtained. How are we to account for those highly developed doctrines which we meet with in the Fathers, the Early Church, and the records of the

Mediaeval Church? Whence has been derived such a definition as that to be found in the New English Dictionary? Some might say that such ideas first saw the light in the pages of the New Testament, or that they were a natural development from New Testament doctrine. But many of these ideas, especially those possessed of a somewhat glaring crudity, cannot be traced back to the New Testament. For the teaching embodied in this collection of writings is characterised, as we shall see later, by a spirit of surprising mildness. More especially is this to be seen in the teaching of Jesus himself; teaching, indeed, which is so mild that Prof. Kennett has gone so far as to say that "Our Lord uses the name Satan in exactly the sense which it bears in the Book of Job." (vide "Interpreter" for October, 1914.)

Our researches would certainly be in a parlous state, were there no literature belonging to the period between the Old and New Testaments, apart from that heterogeneous collection of writings which we call the Apocrypha. But throughout this period there was being produced such a body of literature, a literature whose influence on the New Testament has been so great that it is difficult to estimate its full importance. Nor has the influence of this literature been confined to the Canonical Books of

the New Testament; it is plainly to be observed in a great many of the writings of early Christianity not included in the New Testament.

The books themselves, written --- apart from a few isolated portions --- in the period extending from 180 B.C. to about 200 A.D., are the product of that fresh impetus which was given to Judaism by the Maccabean struggle. As to whence they derived their peculiar character, scholars have made many suggestions. Wellhausen and several others have conjectured that here we have the remains of the secret literature of the Essenes. Their arguments are largely based on the fact that in the Essenes we have the arresting phenomenon of an important school of thought which has seemingly left none of its literature to posterity; and that in the Apocalyptic we have a large literature produced by an unnamed school. Both of these problems would be solved, could the two be causally connected. In support of this theory it has been demonstrated that many of the ideas characteristic of the Apocalyptic books could easily have emanated from the Essenes. Nor do the books themselves seem to have been the product of the schools of the Sadducees or the Zealots.

By others it has been thought that these books

owe their origin to the Pharisees. But while much teaching of a moral content is included which could easily have come from such a source, there is an absence of that typical party-feeling which militates strongly against any hypothesis of this nature. Hence Hassé and others have concluded that these writings have emanated from the pens of democratic non-Pharisaic scribes. Their arguments are based on the idea that Alexandria was no stronghold of Pharisaism, and that apocalyptic seems to have a strongly Alexandrian flavour. Against this it may well be objected that although the latter argument does apply to the Book of Wisdom, it can hardly be held of most of the pseudepigrapha.

But the most likely explanation is that these writings look back to some foreign influence, an influence which is Oriental rather than Hellenistic. Unless we recognise the Iranian characteristics of the Apocalypses, we shall never be able to appreciate their true nature. For in Persia there was an apocalyptic closely resembling that of Judaism. In both there is a strongly-marked element of dualism, resolving itself into a world conflict between God and personified evil. In both there is a Last

Judgment, a grand finale in which the hosts of evil will be completely routed. As we have seen in our previous researches, dualism has hitherto been altogether foreign to Judaistic belief. It has also been altogether characteristic of Iranian philosophy, for in their religious system a complete dualism existed. Ormuzd, Ahura-Mazda, the supreme Good, created all that was good, and inspired every good thought and action: Ahriman, the supreme Evil, created everything that was bad in itself, and everything that could oppose the work of Ormuzd. He marred and frustrated all the good that Ormuzd had created, and systematically attacked every good thought and action, and endeavoured to turn it into evil. Ormuzd and Ahriman were of equal origin, and practically of equal power, and, although the latter was destined some day to be overcome by, and to be subjected to, the former, yet in the meantime he enjoyed an ample share of success.

When, then, we find a similar philosophy of evil suddenly appearing in Jewish literature, it is but natural that we should conclude that such a philosophy has been due to Iranian influences. The countless references made to demons and spirits in the Apocalyptic literature direct our thoughts to the vast spirit-world of Iran. Some scholars, it is true, have seen slight

traces of Iranian influences in the Old Testament itself: but it is in the Apocalypses that they most clearly emerge. With reference to this we may well reproduce some comments of Prof. Cheyne, a few words of which we have already employed in another context: - "Persian influence upon Jewish belief was, I admit, most real, and it evidently increased as time went on (read the Apocalypses from this point of view, not to mention the Talmudic literature). But during a great part of the Persian period the relations between Israel in Palestine and the satraps were not such as to predispose the former to become the conscious imitator of Persia. Indirectly Persia must have influenced the Jews through her vast empire, but directly not so much the Jews in Palestine as the large Israelitish colonies on the East of the Euphrates and the Tigris, which, however, must have transmitted the results to the Jews in Palestine..... Compare the Talmudic saying, 'The angels came up with the Jews from Babylon.' At any rate the mention of Babylon does not forbid us to think likewise of the vast spirit-world of Iran (for even if the Iranian belief in spirits be to some extent historically connected with the Babylonians, it came before the Jews as an independent doctrine). It is true that the Babylonian god Marduk is described as the 'lord of the angel-hosts of heaven and earth' (Sayce,

'Hibbert Lectures' p.99) and this is no isolated expression. But how much more stress is laid in the later Avesta on the fravashis by whose countless and irresistible hosts Ahura Mazda himself is in some sense helped..... Whether the Satan-belief in Job, or even in Chronicles, is materially affected by Iranian doctrine, is a matter for argument. But who can fail to see that the Satan of the Book of Revelation is the fellow of Ahriman? Later Jews even adopted the name Ahriman in the corrupt form Armilos for that ארמילוס 'אֵלֹהֵי הַמָּוֶת' who was to be the last and greatest oppressor of the faithful, and a synonym of Ahriman (Aēshma) dēva 'the raving fiend') in the form of Asmodai." (Origin of the Psalter, pp. 281 - 282.). It is interesting to note that in this last sentence Prof. Cheyne incorrectly identified Ahriman with Aēshma-Daēva. For this see our section on the Book of Tobit.

In view of this outstanding vein of dualism in the Apocalyptic Literature, it is not amazing that here we find a highly developed doctrine of personified evil. It can safely be said that in these writings we have the first definite appearance of a personal Devil. And such an appearance is by no means infrequent. No longer are we faced with the nebulous official of Job and Zechariah, the Satan. Now we meet with an altogether evil person, known

not merely by the name of Satan, but also by such appellatives as Azazel, Belial(Beliar), Mastema, ~~Godreel~~, Sammael, Satanail, etc. No longer is there one single Satan: there are Satans, just as there are hosts of demons.

No longer are the functions of Satan merely the testing and the trying of men. Now we have a malicious enemy --- the Arch-Enemy of mankind. He is the lord of demons and evil spirits. He is responsible for death, disease, and all material evils. He is the lord of this world; he is the ruler over the kingdom of the air. He makes accusation to God against men. And he is responsible for the punishment of sinners.

Much of the evil of the Old Testament is now ascribed to Satan, as are actions once attributed to God, but later regarded as being incompatible with his character. Thus it was not God who attempted to kill Moses at the inn(Exodus IV. 24), but Satan. The temptation of Abraham to offer Isaac (Genesis XXII. 1.) was due to Satan. He, and not God, smote all the firstborn of Egypt (Exodus XII. 29.). In a similar way we find attributed to Satan such events as the Egyptian magicians performing their marvels, the Egyptians pursuing the Israelites, the descendants of Noah falling into sin, Joseph's brethren attempting to slay him, etc.

The demands of this new dualism were such that all these modifications had to be introduced into the teaching of the Old Testament. Innocuous abstract nouns had to be regarded as baneful proper nouns: with the result that the Old Testament words for 'hostility' (הוֹשָׁטַח) and 'worthlessness' (הוֹשָׁטַח) became popular names for Satan, viz:- Mastema and Beliar. Again, a word appearing only in the Book of Leviticus, and possessing there a most doubtful connotation, suddenly reappears in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch as a proper name, Azazel, for one who is the very epitome of all that is evil.

The Fall-story of Genesis III has been fantastically developed to conform with the demands of dualism. No longer do we meet with a mere serpent, one of the beasts 'created by Jehovah God;' now we find that the serpent is identified with Satan, who assumed this form 'as a garment.' His motive, we are told, was envy. And the tree from which Adam and Eve ate was a vine, paving the way for the conception that wine is altogether evil.

The tradition of the fall of the angels in Genesis VI. features largely in the Apocalyptic Books. On it is based the great Myth of the Watchers: and from the supposed cohabitation of the angels and the daughters of men

we are presented with the origin of the evil spirits.

Many of the attributes of Satan, and some of his names, seem clearly to be ascribed to historical personages. Pompey is spoken of both as 'the dragon' and the 'lawless one;' and Beliar seems already, on some few occasions, to denote either Nero or Simon Magus. In some sections the dualism has been carried so far that matter is regarded as being evil. Satan claims to be the 'Lord of Matter.'

Combined with all this dualism we find one of the great characteristics of Apocalyptic --- that element of revelation which looks forward to the Great Judgment. Then the dualism will come to an end. Satan, Satans, and all their hosts of demons and fallen angels will be relegated to the realms of destruction. The fires and the abyss will receive them; and Azazel will, as it were, be assigned to his place of origin, meeting his fate amid the rocks of the wilderness.

It is in this that there lies the hope of the Apocalyptic writings and their writers. For them nothing was so black as the present: nothing so bright as the future. Most pertinently described as 'Tracts for Evil Times', these writings look ever to the good days

which must ultimately come; but previously there must have been the Last Judgment. It is in this connection that Professor Burkitt made a delightful distinction between the conception of Dante and that of the Apocalypses:-

"Nevertheless there is a sense in which Dante's poem marks the triumph of a quite different order of ideas, which robs the ~~the~~ idea of the Last Judgment of most of its significance. Dante goes to the Other World, he sees the dead in Paradise, in Purgatory, or in Hell. For all intents and purposes the Last Judgment has no meaning for them: they are judged already. After such and such a time or mode of probation one by one the souls in Purgatory will leave it to join the souls in Paradise, just as one by one they had arrived. The Other World is a place, which individuals enter one by one when they die; the conception of the Last Judgment, on the other hand, makes the Other World a time, an era, which all individuals experience simultaneously, a "Divine event to which all nature moves." It is this Divine event that is set forth by the Apocalypses. The doctrine of the Apocalypses is the doctrine of the Last Judgment." (Jewish and Christian Apocalypses, page 2.).

It is impossible to form any opinion about the refer-

ences to the Evil One in the New Testament, unless these are read in the light of the teaching of the current apocalyptic. How could an ordinary reader be supposed to understand that passage in the Epistle of Jude, where Stan and Michael contend for the body of Moses? Only one acquainted with the Assumption of Moses could say what these verses really signify. What does Paul mean when he asks: "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" Who are the 'lawless one' and the 'man of lawlessness' in II. Thessalonians? No attempt could be made to answer such questions aright unless there had been a previous knowledge of the Apocalyptic Literature.

We may go further than this: we can safely say that most of the New Testament ideas of personified evil are derived from the Apocalyptic writings. Such an assertion can be tested for its truth in a very simple way. If many of the Satan allusions of the New Testament are due to Apocalyptic, then they should be found to preponderate in that book which is most nearly akin to the non-Canonical Apocalypses, viz: the Book of Revelation. A little search soon reveals the truth of our assertion, for we find more references to the Devil and Satan in this small Book of Revelation than in the whole of the Pauline Epistles.

Dr. Fairweather has given an excellent summary of this aspect of the influences of Apocalyptic:- "To Jewish apocalypse we further owe it that a certain vein of dualism runs through the New Testament writings. Jesus appears as the antagonist of Satan and all his hosts. He came to establish the Kingdom of God, and to destroy the works of the devil. Although the popular belief in demons did not lend itself to theological treatment, and has no prominent place in the Pauline epistles, the apostle speaks of the devil as 'the god of this world,' 'the prince of the power of the air.' And in the Fourth Gospel we have an approach to a regular dualistic system. Two kingdoms confront one another --- those of light and darkness, truth and falsehood, freedom and bondage; those of Christ the Saviour of the world, and the devil the prince of this world. This point of view is distinctly reminiscent of Jewish apocalypse." (The Background of the Gospels, third edition, page 295.).

In the course of our examination of the individual books which go to make up this literature, we shall pay special attention to any thoughts or expressions which seem to find parallels in the New Testament. It is only by this means that we shall be able to demonstrate

the reliance of the New Testament upon the Apocalyptic Literature.

THE ETHIOPIC BOOK OF ENOCH

This is by far the most important book of the pseud-epigraphic literature. A composite work, some of its sections (i.e. Chapters VI - XXXVI, LXXII - XC.) were written as early as 160 B.C., the remaining chapters being added in the first century B.C. Thus, partially at least, it is one of the earliest extant examples of the non-canonical apocalypses. Several different writers have had their share in its composition, and several different conceptions are manifested. But what renders the book most valuable for us is the influence which it exerted over subsequent generations.

To gauge the importance of this book we need only study the Epistle of Jude. Here we find the Book of Enoch quoted by name, the writer of the epistle evidently regarding it as inspired prophecy. "Raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame, wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of blackness for ever. And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints. To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their

ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." (Jude, 13-15.).

Not only in this Epistle of Jude, but throughout the New Testament, these influences of Enoch are clearly to be seen. As Dr. Charles says:- "The influence of I. Enoch on the New Testament has been greater than that of all the other apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books taken together." (The Book of Enoch, Second Edition, p. xcv.). Almost all the writers of the New Testament were familiar with it, and its influence is to be observed no less in their thought than in their diction.

In literature other than that of the New Testament traces of the Book of Enoch boldly appear. It has been employed by the writers of such work as the Book of Jubilees, the Apocalypse of Baruch, and II. Esdras. Barnabas quotes it as Scripture. Use was made of it by the writer of the Apocalypse of Peter; and there are significantly close parallels between it and the writings of Justin Martyr, Tatian, Minucius Felix, and Irenaeus. Such was the importance of the book that in certain quarters it was believed to have been actually written by Enoch himself. This is revealed in a well-known passage from Tertullian:- "I am

aware that the Scripture of Enoch, which has assigned this order of action to angels, is not received by some, because it is not admitted into the Jewish canon either. I suppose they did not think that, having been published before the deluge, it could safely have survived that world-wide calamity, the abolisher of all things. If that is the reason for rejecting it, let them recall to their memory that Noah, the survivor of the deluge, was the great-grandson of Enoch himself; and he, of course, had heard and remembered, from domestic renown and hereditary tradition, concerning his own great-grandfather's 'grace in the sight of God' and concerning all his preachings; since Enoch had given no other charge to Methuselah than that he should hand on the knowledge of them to his posterity. Noah, therefore, no doubt, might have succeeded in the trusteeship of his preaching, or, had the case been otherwise, he would not have been silent alike concerning the disposition of things made by God, his Preserver, and concerning the particular glory of his own house. If Noah had not had this conservative power by so short a route, there would still be this consideration to warrant our assertion of the genuineness of this Scripture: he could equally have reheved it, under the Spirit's inspiration, after it had been destroyed by the violence of the deluge, as, after the destruction of Jerusalem by the

Babylonian storming of it, every document of the Jewish literature is generally agreed to have been restored through Ezra. But since Enoch in the same Scripture has preached likewise concerning the Lord, nothing at all must be rejected by us which pertains to us; and we read that 'every Scripture suitable for edification is divinely inspired.' By the Jews it may now seem to have been rejected for that very reason, just like all the other portions nearly which tell of Christ." (De Cultu Femin: I.3. translated in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library.).

This quotation we have given at length, not merely on account of its naive acceptance of Enoch as the actual writer, but also in view of the belief embodied in the inspiration of the Book of Enoch. It is not hard to estimate what was the great influence of this book during the first two centuries of our era. Later, however, it began to decline in importance. Origen did not reject the book, but he refused to regard it as being inspired. Jerome regarded it as being apocryphal, offering this as an explanation of the rejection of the Epistle of Jude which, as has already been said, quotes from Enoch. Augustine had but little regard for Enoch:- "Scripsisse quidem nonnulla divina Enoch illum septimum ab Adam, negare non possumus, cum hoc in Epistola canonica Iudas Apostolus dicat. Sed non frustra non sunt in

eo canone Scripturarum.....Unde illa quae sub ejus nomine proferuntur et continent istas de gigantibus fabulas, quod non habuerint homines patres, recte a prudentibus judicantur non ipsius esse credenda" (De Civ. Dei, XV. 23. 4.)

At last, having been condemned in most definite language in the Apostolic Constitutions, the Book of Enoch slowly disappeared from the Church, attracting but little attention until the nineteenth century.

Having thus noted the great importance of the book in the Early Church, we must now investigate its contents. It has many contributions to make to the philosophy of evil, more especially to that aspect of the subject which endeavours to assign some sort of personality to supreme evil. Most of those details which in later days were to be found in conceptions of a personal devil are to be traced back to the Book of Enoch. The ideas of the Early Church and of the New Testament no longer seem to be original contributions when this book has been closely studied. We cannot, of course, suggest that all this new doctrine of the Devil was invented by the writers of Enoch. But we can assert that most of it here finds its expression in extant literature for the first time. Professor Burkitt has laid great stress on the importance of Enoch from the aspect of the problem of evil:-

"It is an attempt to see the world steadily and to see it whole, to unify the physical world, the moral world, and the political world, the world, that is, of the national destiny of God's chosen people. It contains a serious attempt to account for the presence of Evil in human history, and this attempt claims our attention, because it is in essential the view presupposed in the Gospels, especially the Synoptic Gospels. It is when you study Matthew, Mark, and Luke against the background of the Books of Enoch that you see them in their true perspective. In saying this I have no intention of detracting from the importance of what the Gospels report to us. On the contrary, it puts familiar words into their proper setting. Indeed it seems to me that some of the best-known Sayings of Jesus only appear in their true light if regarded as Midrash upon words and concepts taken from Enoch, words and concepts that were familiar to those who heard the Prophet of Galilee, though now they are forgotten by Jew and Christian alike," (Jewish and Christian Apocalypses, page 21.).

Perhaps the most interesting contribution made by the Book of Enoch is its development of the Myth of the Watchers. Apart from a single passage (LXIX.11.) the origin of moral evil is ascribed to the Watchers, and not to the fall of Adam. The germs of the Watcher-story are to be found in

Genesis VI. where the sons of God are stated to have engaged in intercourse with the daughters of men, thereby begetting a race of giants.

"And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. And the Lord said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years. There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown." (vv 1-4).

Thus much for the origin of the myth. The next stage in the tracing of its development takes us to the Book of Daniel. Here, in the Aramaic, we find references to angelic beings known as 'watchers' (ܘܬܪܬܝܢ). "I saw in the visions of my head upon my bed, and, behold, a watcher and an holy one came down from heaven" (IV.10.). "This matter is by the decree of the watchers, and by the demand of the holy ones." (IV.14.). "And whereas the king saw a watcher and a holy one." (IV. 20.).

In the Hebrew portions of the Old Testament there are to be found examples of the verb ִשָּׁר - 'to watch' - being used of superhuman beings. In Isaiah we find the participle

employed in this way:- "I have set watchmen upon they walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day nor night: ye that make mention of the Lord, keep not silence. And give him not rest, till he establish, and till he make Jerusalem a praise for ever." (LXII, 6, 7.). The same verb, in the infinitive, is used in Genesis of the cherubim guarding the garden of Eden:- "So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim, and a flaming sword which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life." (III. 24.).

In the early apocalyptic literature the angels are often called Watchers, the term being used of both the good and the fallen angels. The Book of Jubilees, an apocalypse written at about the same time which produced the Book of Enoch, provides some interesting evidence. "For in his days the angels of the Lord descended on the earth, those who are named the Watchers, that they should instruct the children of men, and that they should do judgment and uprightness on the earth." (IV.15.). Then comes the story of their fall:- "And he testified to the Watchers, who had sinned with the daughters of men; for they had begun to unite themselves, so as to be defiled, with the daughters of men, and Enoch testified against

them." (IV. 22.).

Now from this unholy union - according to the apocalypses - there resulted a progeny which took the form of evil spirits. "And in the third week of this jubilee the unclean demons began to lead astray the children of the sons of Noah and to make to err and destroy them.---- And thou knowest how they Watchers, the fathers of these spirits, acted in my day: and as for these spirits which are living, imprison them ----- for they are malignant and created in order to destroy." (Jubilees X. 1. ff.).

It will be remembered that in Genesis VI. we were told that the progeny of the 'sons of God' and the daughters of men were 'giants'. In this rendering of the original Hebrew our English Versions evidently follow the LXX (γίγαντες) and the Vulgate 'gigantes.' But the word in the Hebrew is ג'ב'ל, and, correctly or incorrectly philologically, would ever suggest to a Semitic-speaking person the idea of falling. That the 'sons of God' (verse 1.) were regarded as being angels is to be seen from the LXX rendering, viz: ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ.

In yet another contemporary apocalypse, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, we find references to the Myth of the Watchers. Here are given details as to how

the actual fall took place: the responsibility for such a fall is ascribed, not so much to the Watchers themselves, as to the daughters of men. "Flee, therefore, fornication ----- because every woman who useth these wiles hath been reserved for eternal punishment. For thus they allured the Watchers who were before the flood; for as these continually beheld them, they lusted after them, and they conceived the act in their mind; for they changed themselves into the shape of men, and appeared to them when they were with their husbands. And the women lusting in their minds after their forms, gave birth to giants, for the Watchers appeared to them as reaching even unto heaven." (Test. Reuben, V. 5ff.). In this passage we may note some interesting and important refinements of the Myth of the Watchers. In the first place, there was an apparent incarnation of the Watchers in human form: a conception which finds a somewhat similar counterpart in the later ideas of Incubi and Succubi. In the second place, an attempt is made to explain the abnormal stature of the progeny, this being held to be due to the apparently huge size of the Watchers, as existing in the minds of the women. It should also be observed that there emerges a clear indication of the current

4..... a connotation identical with that presupposed by the translators of the LXX, viz: giants.

A further reference to the Watchers is to be found in the Testament of Naphtali. Here they are stated to have been responsible for the Lord sending the flood. "In like manner also the Watchers changed the order of their nature, whom the Lord cursed at the flood, on whose account he made the earth without inhabitant and fruitless." (III. 5.).

These, in the main, are the features of the Myth of the Watchers which are found also in the Book of Enoch. The term is used of the angels, both in their pristine, and in their fallen, states. That the archangels are indicated at times -- and not the fallen angels -- is obvious from such passages as the following: "Before these things Enoch was hidden, and no one of the children of men knew where he was hidden, and where he abode, and what had become of him. And his activities had to do with the Watchers, and his days were with the holy ones." (XII.1,2.). Here we have no suggestion that these Watchers are to be equated with the fallen angels of Genesis VI. The entire reference, and more especially the parallelism existing between the words 'Watchers'

and 'holy ones', can look back to nothing more serious than the reference to the Watchers in Daniel IV. A similar conception, it is presumed, influenced the editors of certain modern hymnals when incorporating "Ye watchers and ye holy ones" in their collections.

This same attitude is to be seen in the section giving the names of the archangels. "And these are the names of the holy angels who watch." (XX.1.). "Those who sleep not bless thee: they stand before thy throne and bless, praise, and extol, saying: 'Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Spirits: he filleth the earth with spirits.' And here my eyes saw all those who sleep not: they stand before him and bless and say: 'Blessed be thou, and blessed be the name of the Lord for ever and ever.'" (XXXIX. 12,13.). It is not difficult to arrive at the conclusion that 'those who sleep not' is merely a synonym for the Watchers. That this conclusion is correct may be seen from the parallelism in the following: "All who sleep not above in heaven shall bless him: all the holy ones who are in heaven shall bless him, and all the elect who dwell in the garden of life." (LXI.12.)

But now we must study what Enoch has to say about those other Watchers, the fallen angels. Whereas, ac-

according to the passage - already quoted - from the Book of Jubilees the Watchers had been sent down to the earth to instruct men, and that while performing this duty they lusted after the women, according to Enoch it was their lust which was the direct cause of their descent to the earth. "Now it came to pass when the children of men had multiplied that in those days were born unto them beautiful and comely daughters. And the angels, the children of the heaven, saw and lusted after them, and said to one another: 'Come, let us choose wives from among the children of men and beget us children.'" (VI. 1,2.).

Characteristic of the Book of Enoch's version of the Myth of the Watchers is the wealth of detail which it gives. Thus we find specified the exact number of the fallen angels; there are details as to the scene of their descent; and we are even told of the names of their leaders. "And they were in all two hundred; who descended in the days of Jared on the summit of Mount Hermon, and they called it Mount Hermon, because they had sworn and bound themselves by mutual imprecations upon it. And these are the names of their leaders: Semiazaz, their leader, Arakiba, Rameel, Kokabiel,

Tamiel, Ramiel, Danel, Ezeqeel, Baraqijal, Asael, Armaros, Batarel, Ananel, Zaqiel, Samsapeel, Staarel, Turel, Jomjael, Sariel. These are the chiefs of tens." (VI. 6-8.).

How nearly we are approaching a personification of supreme evil may well be estimated from the manner in which all human sin is traced back to these Watchers. "And they have gone to the daughters of men upon the earth, and have slept with the women, and have defiled themselves, and revealed to them all kinds of sins. And the women have born giants, and the whole earth has thereby been filled with blood and unrighteousness." (IX. 8,9.). The giants, the fruits of this unnatural union, are identified with the evil spirits: "And go, say to the Watchers of heaven, who have sent you to intercede for them; 'You should intercede for men, and not men for you.....And though ye were holy, spiritual, living the eternal life, you have defiled yourselves with the blood of women, and have begotten children with the blood of flesh.' -----And now, the giants, who are produced from the spirits and flesh, shall be called evil spirits upon the earth, and on the earth shall be their dwelling. Evil spirits have proceeded from their bodies; because they are born from men, and from the holy Watchers is their beginning and primal origin; they shall be evil spirits on earth, and evil spirits shall they be called." (XV. 2-9.).

Of all the fallen angels, Asael, or Azazel, receives the most prominence in the Book of Enoch, although, as we have seen, it is Semiazaz who is mentioned as their chief. Looking back to that Azazel mentioned in the ritual of the Day of Atonement (Leviticus XVI. 8ff.) the use of this term manifests one of the most striking features of the development of the idea of personified evil. A word occurring in the Old Testament with a doubtful but suspected meaning is taken by later writers in an altogether personal sense and is given a connotation of the greatest evil. No better examples of this can be put forward than the use of Mastema in Jubilees, and Beliar in several of the apocalyptic writings, as well as in St. Paul. The same applies to the use of AZAZEL in the Book of Enoch. In the Old Testament the word appears nowhere except in the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus: and even here it has a meaning which is obscure in the extreme. But a cursory examination of the commentaries and the dictionaries will serve to show that we can hope to learn little about what this Azazel was. It may have been some baneful demon: it may have been some eerie locality of the desert.

No such uncertainty as to the nature of Azazel is revealed by the Book of Enoch. Not only a most prominent fallen angel, he is also the great teacher of mankind in

in various arts of evil. Amongst these are specified the making of lethal weapons and the preparation of cosmetics. "And Azazel taught men to make swords, and knives, and shields, and breastplates, and made known to them the metals of the earth, and the art of working them, and bracelets, and ornaments, and the use of antimony, and the beautifying of the eyelids, and all kinds of costly stones, and all colouring tinctures. And there arose much godlessness, and they committed fornication, and they were led astray, and became corrupt in all their ways." (VIII.1,2.). More than any other of the fallen Watchers does Azazel seem to have been regarded as the instigator of mankind to sin. He it is who is the great enemy of mankind. Apart from the single detail of his name, Azazel is the exact equivalent of the highly-coloured Satan of later ages. In this one sense at least, the Book of Enoch stands out as marking the most important development ever to be noted in this study of personified evil. Let us investigate some typical passages: "Thou seest what Azazel hath done, who taught all unrighteousness on earth and revealed the eternal secrets which were preserved in heaven, which men were striving to learn." (IX.6.). "And the whole earth has been corrupted through the works that were taught by Azazel: to him

ascribe all sin." (X.8.).

Here, it might reasonably be said, we have an extremely close approximation to a dualism. Such an interpretation is perfectly justifiable, always provided that it is recognised that this dualism is not of an absolute nature, and that it is never eternal. For the day will come when supreme evil, in the person of Azazel, will at last be overcome. God and his archangels will prevail, and Azazel will be bound in chains, in those desert wilds with which he was originally associated. "And again the Lord said to Raphael: 'Bind Azazel hand and foot, and cast him into the darkness: and make an opening in the desert, which is in Dudael, and east him therein. And place upon him rough and jagged rocks, and cover him with darkness, and let him abide there for ever, and cover his face that he may not see light. And on the day of the great judgment he shall be cast into the fire.'" (X.4-6.).

In a later section of the Book of Enoch, Chapters XXXVII - LXXI, a similar conception is to be observed. Enoch is depicted as visiting the Valley of Judgment:- "And I looked and turned to another part of the earth, and saw there a deep valley with burning fire. And they brought the kings, and the mighty, and began to cast them into this deep valley. And there mine eyes saw how they

made there their instruments, iron chains of immeasurable weight. And I asked the angel of peace who went with me, saying: 'For whom are these chains being prepared?' And he said unto me: 'These are being prepared for the hosts of Azazel, so that they may take them and cast them into the abyss of complete condemnation, and they shall cover their jaws with rough stones as the Lord of Spirits commanded.'" (LIV. 1-5.).

This conception of the final destruction of the Enemy of Mankind finds its parallels in many later writings. Of these a few New Testament passages may here be noted. In the Gospel of St. Matthew, in his section dealing with the last judgment --- a section not found in the other Synoptic Gospels, and possessing a significantly apocalyptic nature - we read that "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory-----Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into the everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." (Matt. XXV.41.).

Somewhat similar ideas are apparent in the Book of Revelation:- "And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him

a thousand years. And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more." (XX.2,3.). "And the devil, that deceived them, was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever." (XX.10.).

In the Book of Enoch, Azazel is not always mentioned by name. In an early section, Chapters LXXXIII-XC, the Dream-Visions, he is referred to as a star. "And again I saw with mine eyes as I slept, and I saw the heaven above, and behold a star fell from heaven, and it arose and ate and pastured amongst those oxen." (LXXXVI.1.). "And I saw one of those four who had come forth first, and he seized that first star which had fallen from the heaven, and bound it hand and foot and cast it into the abyss: now that abyss was narrow and deep, and horrible and dark." (LXXXVIII.1.). With this we may well compare a passage from the Book of Revelation. "And the fifth angel sounded, and I saw a star fall from heaven unto the earth: and to him was given the key of the bottomless pit." (IX.1.).

Here it may perhaps be mentioned that later ages began to see a reference to the Devil and his fall in

in the denunciation of Babylon in Isaiah. "How art thou fallen from heaven, O day star, son of the morning." (XIV. 12.). It is indeed permissible to conjecture that this mis-interpretation - for the reference cannot be to any other than the king of Babylon - may in some way reflect those tendencies which led the apocalyptists to associate Azazel with a falling star.

We have already drawn attention to the fact that Azazel is often described as having been responsible for the errors of mankind. To him was ascribed all sin; and he had taught all unrighteousness on earth. This too finds its parallel in the New Testament:- "And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole earth (world): he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." (Revelation XII.9.).

Before leaving Azazel and the Myth of the Watchers, it may be asked if the story of the fallen angels is anywhere paralleled in the New Testament. To this question an affirmative answer must be given. In the first place, there is that famous passage in the Epistle of Jude:- "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day."

(verse 6.). "Wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever. And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, etc." (verses 13, 14.). In this last passage it is more than significant that the word 'star' should be employed. The Second Epistle of Peter furnishes another excellent parallel:- "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved for judgment." (II.4.).

There may also be a reference to the fallen angels in that passage of I. Corinthians where Paul advocates the custom of women having their heads covered. The verse in question runs as follows:- "For this cause ought the woman to have authority over her head, because of the angels." (I. Corinthians. XI.10, following the marginal rendering of the Revised Version.). Several have seen in this a reference to the fallen angels, Tertullian going so far as to say that this step was essential lest the angels might be enticed to lust. "He adds: 'Because of the angels.' What angels? In other words, whose angels? If he means the fallen angels of the Creator, there is great propriety in his meaning. It is right that the face which was a snare to them should wear some mask of a humble guise and obscured beauty." (Contm Mar: Book V, chpa. VIII.). Tertullian offers a similar explanation

in his treatise 'On the Veiling of Women':- "For if it is on account of the angels --- those, to wit, whom we read of as having fallen from God and heaven on account of concupiscence after females --- who can presume that it was bodies already defiled, and relics of human lust, which such angels yearned after, so as not rather to have been inflamed for virgins, whose bloom pleads an excuse for human lust likewise?" (Chapter VII.).

Several developments in the idea of the personification of evil have already been observed. Now our attention must be rivetted on one further development, Evil has been personified, but into persons rather than into one single person. It is true that Azazel has the prominence: at the same time he is merely one of the twenty ---- this is the correct number, although only nineteen are mentioned in our texts ---- captains of ten. Here we have a most important stage in the evolution of what may be termed - although the name has had to be coined for the occasion - polysatanism. Man has a strong tendency to create many gods: no weaker is his tendency to fabricate many Satans. And from this time onwards the fabrication progressed at an ever increasing rate. The sixteenth century saw this aspect at its very zenith.

How vast were the numbers of Devils and Demons at this time may be estimated from some calculations in the De Presigiis of Jean Weir (Basle, 1568). Here the diabolic monarchy is made to consist of 72 Princes and 7,405,926 Devils divided into 1,111 legions of 6666 each, "apart from errors of calculation."

Bearing this in mind, we may now turn to a somewhat later section of the Book of Enoch, those chapters which are commonly called the Parables of Enoch (XXXVII-LXXI). Here the philosophy of evil is rather different from that of the rest of the book: and here Satan is mentioned by name. The origin of sin does not rest with the Watchers. It looks back to the Satans, the adversaries of mankind; and it was to these Satans that the Watchers had become subject.

Even in this section that tendency to multiply Devils manifests itself. A Satan is mentioned: there are also Satans. These latter belong to a kingdom of evil, ruled over by Satan. They existed as evil agencies before the fall of the Watchers, whose guilt consisted in their becoming subject to the Satans. In some slight way, these Satans are reminiscent of the Testing Angel of Job and Zechariah, for they have the right of access into heaven, where they exercised the function of making accusations

to God about the inhabitants of the earth. "And the third voice I heard pray and intercede for those who dwell on the earth and supplicate in the name of the Lord of Spirits. And I heard the fourth voice fending off the Satans and forbidding them to come before the Lord of Spirits to accuse them who dwell on the earth." (XL.6,7.).

Along with this we may well place in parallel a passage from the New Testament. "And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night. And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony." (Revelation XII,10,11.).

Another function of these Satans is to lead both angels and men into transgression. "The name of the first Jecon: that is, the one who led astray all the sons of God, and brought them down to the earth, and led them astray through the daughters of men. And the second was named Asbeel: he imparted to the holy sons of God evil counsel, and led them astray so that they defiled their bodies with the daughters of men. And the third was named Gadreel: he it is who showed the

children of men all the blows of death, etc." (LXIX. 4-6.).

Sometimes the Satans are called 'angels of punishment,' and as such they are shown to possess yet a third function. This is to punish those who have sinned: "And I saw there the hosts of the angels of punishment going, and they held scourges and chains of iron and bronze. And I asked the angel of peace who went with me, saying: 'To whom are these who hold the scourges going?' And he said unto me: 'To their elect and beloved ones that they may be cast into the chasm of the abyss of the valley. And then that valley shall be filled with their elect and beloved, and the days of their lives shall be at an end, and the days of their leading astray shall not thenceforward be reckoned." (LVI. 1-4.). "For I saw all the angels of punishment abiding there and preparing all the instruments of Satan. And I asked the angel of peace who went with me: 'For whom are they preparing these instruments?' And he said unto me: 'They prepare these for the kings and the mighty of the earth, that they may thereby be destroyed.'" (LIII. 3-5.).

That such a conception as this does not lack its parallels in the New Testament may be gathered from the two following quotations from the Epistles. "For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath

so done this deed----- To deliver such an one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." (I.Cōrinthians. V. 3-5.). "Holding faith, and a good conscience; which some having put away, concerning faith have made shipwreck: of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander, whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme." (I.Timothy. I. 19,20.).

Before leaving this section, the Parables of Enoch, we must direct our investigations to what in many ways is the most important of the contributions which it makes. Here, for the first time --- unless the traditional interpretation of Wisdom II.24 be accepted --- we have the serpent of the Fall-story of Genesis associated with something superhuman or supernatural. It is not to be said that the serpent is identified with Satan, but it must be recognised that it is intimately associated with one of the Satans. (N.B. It is in the Slavonic Book of Enoch that we must look for the definite association of the Devil with the serpent). The passage which supports this runs as follows:- "And the third was named Gadreel: he it is who showed the children of men all the blows of death, and he led astray Eve, and showed the weapons of death to the sons of men, the shield and the coat of

mail, and the sword for battle, and all the weapons of death to the children of men. And from his hand they have proceeded against those who dwell on the earth from that day and for evermore." (LXIX.6,7.).

While investigating this passage we may draw attention to a phenomenon which occurs here, and in several other later writings. Throughout the pages of the Old Testament it is to be observed that various evils -- or what were later regarded as evils -- are attributed to God. These, in subsequent writings, are attributed to the Evil One or his subordinates. Thus in Psalm CXLIV we read:- "Blessed be the Lord my strength, which teacheth my hands to war, and my fingers to fight." (verse 1.). But in this passage from the Parables of Enoch which we have been examining, it is Gadreel, one of the Satans, who is held responsible for this side of man's education. In the earlier portions of Enoch it was Azazel who fulfilled a similar function:- "And Azazel taught men to make swords, and knives, and shields and breastplates." (VIII.1.).

Throughout the whole of the Book of Enoch moral evil is ascribed, in its origin, to the lust of the Watchers. There is, however, one single exception: and here it is brought into causal connection with the transgression of

Adam. This one passage is closely connected with the verses which we have just quoted with reference to the seduction of Eve. Here it is asserted that man was in the beginning created righteous and immortal, but that death obtained dominion over him through sin. "For men were created exactly like the angels, to the intent that they should continue pure and righteous, and death, which destroys everything, could not have taken hold of them, but through this their knowledge they are perishing, and through this power it is consuming me." (LXIX.11.).

Amongst the Satans mentioned by name there is one whose special function seems to be the inflicting of illness and physical misfortune. "And the fifth was named Kasdeja: this is he who showed the children of men all the wicked smittings of spirits and demons, and the smittings of the embryo in the womb, that it may pass away, and the smittings of the soul, the bites of the serpent, and the smittings which befall through the noontide heat." (LXIX.12.). Throughout later writings it is a common occurrence to find diseases of the human body attributed to Satan. This will be observed in the New Testament, e.g. the instance of the healing of the woman 'which had a spirit

of infirmity eighteen years.' When our Lord had been rebuked by the ruler of the synagogue for healing her on the Sabbath, he retorted, "Thou hypocrite, doth not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, to be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day?" (Luke XIV.15,16.). At the same time it should be remembered that as early as the Book of Job, the conception was held that Satan could be the agent in the inflicting of bodily misform-
unes.

The question now arises as to whether the New Testament anywhere reflects the doctrine of the many Satans found in the Parables of Enoch. Without any hesitation it can be asserted that the plural of the word 'Satan' is never found in the New Testament. But there are two passages in which the word has no definite article in the original Greek. We may indeed feel suspicious about one of these, for the reference is to some bodily affliction. The passage to be investigated is II. Corinthians XII.7. "ἀγγέλος Σατάν ἡμᾶς κολοῖ." This could perfectly correctly be translated by:- "A thorn in the flesh, a Satan-angel, to buffet me." The second

passage occurs in St. Mark, a section which is given also by St. Matthew, who is most careful to add that definite article which is absent in the earlier Gospel. πῶς δύναται Σατανᾶς Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν; (Mark III.23.). Is it reading too much into the absence of the definite article to suggest that we have here a reference to the Satans, as found in the Book of Enoch? Dare we translate this by:- "Can a Satan cast out a Satan?" Both these passages will be examined in detail in our investigation of the New Testament teaching: and it is until then that we shall reserve our conclusions.

THE BOOK OF JUBILEES.

This work, originally written in Hebrew by a member of the Pharisaic school in the period 135-105 B.C., seems to be little more than an enlarged Targum on Genesis and Exodus. It reflects "the genuine spirit of later Judaism infused into the primitive history of the world." (Charles, The Book of Jubilees, p. xiii.). The attitude of the writer towards that portion of the Old Testament which he employs is somewhat similar to the attitude of the Chronicler towards Samuel and Kings. Violently opposed to the Gentiles, his object appears to have been the glorification of Israel in general; of the Law and the Patriarchs in particular.

The book is a landmark in the development of the ideas of personified evil. Here are reflected doctrines which closely approximate to those of a much later period. Satan is mentioned by name five times; and now the name no longer indicates an angelic official with unpleasant duties. Satan in Jubilees is a malevolent and personal foe. This is clearly to be seen from the fact that, of the five occasions when the word occurs, in four of the passages we find the expression 'the evil one' placed in parallel. "And Pharaoh's kingdom was well ordered, and there was no Satan and no evil person therein." (XL.9.). "And there was no Satan nor any evil all the days of the life of Joseph which he lived after his father Jacob." (XLVI.2.).

Satan is regarded as being of great power, and only the righteous of Israel are able to escape his clutches. He it is who has to punish the wicked:- "All the malignant ones we bound in the place of condemnation, and a tenth part of them we left that they might be subject before Satan on the earth." (X.8.).

In the end, Satan's kingdom will be overthrown, and his power will vanish. "And all their days they will complete, and live in peace and joy, and there will be no Satan nor any evil destroyer: for all their days

will be days of blessing and healing." (XXIII.29.). "And the jubilees will pass by, until Israel is cleansed from all guilt of fornication-----and there will be no more a Satan or any evil one, and the land will be clean from that time for evermore." (L.5.).

The writer of Jubilees does not always speak of the Devil as Satan. He frequently employs a new name, Mastema. In no other known literature does this word occur as a proper noun except in two passages. The first of these is to be found in the Acts of Philip:- "And Mastema, that is, Satan, entered into Ananias unawares, and filled him with anger and rage" (Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol.XVI, p. 319.). The second reappearance of the word is in the Fragments of a Zadokite Work:- "And on the day on which the man imposes it upon himself to return to the law of Moses, the angel of Mastema will depart from him if he make good his word." (XX.2.). At this juncture we may draw attention to a sentence in Charles' edition of Jubilees (published in 1902.)-----"Outside the Jubilee literature, as Rönisch has remarked, this word is not found as a proper name except in the Acts of Philip." (Book of Jubilees, p. 80.). When the same scholar edited the Zadokite Fragments in 1912 (Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament) he

discovered this second appearance of the name.

The history of the word is worthy of investigation. Evidently connected with the root STM (סמח), the form Mastema (מסמח), meaning 'hostility', occurs twice in the Book of Hosea (IX. 7,8.). "The prophet is a fool, the spiritual man is mad, for the multitude of thine iniquity, and the great hatred." "But the prophet is a snare of the fowler in all his ways, and hatred in the house of his God." In both these passages the LXX translates מסמח by *μανία* : while Jerome has 'amentia' for the former instance, and 'insania' for the latter. We may safely conclude that the word was nothing more than an abstract noun, and that it was generally regarded as such by later interpreters: that any attempt at personification seems to be peculiar to the writers of Jubilees, the Acts of Peter, and the Zadokite Fragments.

Mastema is called the 'chief of the spirits' (X.8.), an epithet which Charles regards as having influenced the writers of the Gospels - "He hath Beelzebul, and by the prince of the demons casteth he out demons." (Mark III.22)

He is quite obviously identified with Satan, for in Chapter X. Mastema asks the Lord to hand over to him some of the spirits of men. This request was granted:- "And

a tenth part of them we left that they might be subject before Satan on the earth." (verse 11.).

His functions are far wider and far more numerous than those of the testing angel of Job and Zechariah. He is the head of the evil spirits, he tempts men, leading them astray and blinding them. He hardens their hearts. He accuses men of real or alleged sins: he destroys those who have sinned. With his evil spirits he seeks to rule over men in order that he may effect their destruction:- "And let not wicked spirits rule over them, lest they should destroy them from the earth." (X.3.).

Mastema is regarded as having been responsible for many incidents in the history of Israel which the Old Testament mentions as having been done by God. Thus, in explaining the story of Abraham offering up Isaac, the writer of Jubilees attributes to Mastema the conduct which he regards as being unworthy of God. "And the prince Mastema came and said before God, 'Behold, Abraham loves Isaac his son, and he delights in him above all things else; bid him offer him as a burnt-offering on the altar, and thou wilt see if he will do this command, and thou wilt know if he is faithful in everything wherein thou dost try him.'" (XVII.16.). When, at last, Abraham's virtue triumphs and the ram is seen in the thicket, Mastema is disappointed:

"And the prince of the Mastema was put to shame." (XVIII. 12.).

The stories of the Book of Exodus are duly elaborated in Jubilees, and Mastema makes frequent appearances. Thus, he it was who was responsible for the slaying of the first-born of Egypt:- "Ye were eating the passover in Egypt, when all the powers of Mastema had been let loose to slay all the first-born of Pharaoh to the first-born of the captive maid-servant in the mill, and to the cattle." (XLIX. 2.). It was Mastema who helped the sorcerers of Egypt to effect their feats of magic: he was the instigator of the pursuit of the fugitives. "The prince of the Mastema was not put to shame because he took courage and cried to the Egyptians to pursue after thee with all the powers of the Egyptians, with their chariots, and with their horses, and with all the hosts of the peoples of Egypt." (XLVIII.12.).

Again, in Exodus there is the incident of the attempt on the life of Moses for which God is held to be responsible. "And it came to pass by the way in the inn, that the Lord met him, and sought to kill him." (Exodus IV.24.). Later readers naturally found it difficult to accept this passage, implying, as it does, an incongruity in the actions of God. The LXX and the Targums do not hesitate to substitute for 'the Lord' the words 'the angel of the Lord.'

But the writer of Jubilees goes much further than this, attributing the action to Mastema. "And thou thyself knowest what he spake unto thee on Mount Sinai, and what prince Mastema desired to do with thee when thou wast retruning into Egypt on the way when thou didst meet him at the lodging-place. Did he not with all his power seek to slay thee and deliver the Egyptians out of thy hand when he saw that thou wast sent to execute judgment and vengeance on the Egyptians?" (XLVIII. 2,3.).

As we have already remarked, Jubilees strives to do for Genesis and Exodus what Chronicles did for Samuel and Kings. With reference to this tendency we must, in all fairness towards the more common interpretation of I. Chronicles XXI.1., note that here also we find an attempt made to exonerate God of that incongruity of action presupposed in the story of the numbering of the people, as narrated in II. Samuel XXIV.1. If, as many believe, the 'Satan' of Chronicles refers to the Devil, then we have an excellent to the introduction of Mastema in Jubilees. If, on the other hand, we hold that the word Satan refers to some earthly adversary, there is still manifested the attempt to acquit God of the responsibility of having been the direct cause of David's sin.

It should be remembered that between the time of the writing of Chronicles and that of Jubilees there had elapsed a period sufficiently long for ideas of a superhuman adversary to develop. Long ~~enough~~ enough, in fact, for a superhuman adversary to be substituted for some ordinary earthly foe.

There is yet one other most important development to be observed in Jubilees. Beliar is mentioned as a proper name of Satan, or of some Satanic spirit. This word and its use will be discussed at length in a subsequent chapter: suffice it now to say that it is a form of the Hebrew 'belial' a word occurring frequently in the Old Testament, and apparently bearing the meaning of 'worthlessness.' As with Mastema, the abstract noun has become a proper noun - the name of some personification of evil. "And let not the spirit of Beliar rule over them to accuse them before thee, and to ensnare them from all the paths of righteousness, so that they may perish from before thy face." (I.20.). "For in the flesh of their circumcision they will omit this circumcision of their sons, and all of them, sons of Beliar, will leave their sons uncircumcised as they were born." (XV.33.). The word occurs frequently as a proper name in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and we may safely conclude

with Dr. Charles that "as early as the second century B.C. Beliar was regarded as a Satanic spirit." (The Book of Jubilees, p. 113.). That this personal use of the word was known to St. Paul is evident from II. Corinthians:- "And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" (VI. 15.).

The Fall-story is treated by the writer of Jubilees, but for this the serpent, as in Genesis, is held to have been responsible. No reference is made to Satan as the instigator of the serpent; nor are Satan and the serpent identified. According to Glycas (circa 1150, ed. Bekker, p. 206.), one of the texts of Jubilees (III.23) indicated that the serpent had originally four feet. This is also suggested by Josephus in his Antiquities:- πρὸν τε αὐτὸν ἀποστέργουσιν κ.τ.λ. (Book I, Chap. I.4.).

In Jubilees, just as there is a kingdom of angels, so also is there a well-developed demonic kingdom, ruled over by Satan (Mastema) "the chief of the spirits." His subjects are the demons, the spirits which issued from the dead bodies of the children of the Watchers and the daughters of men (X.5.). It is by means of these spirits that Mastema is able to realise his evil purposes, viz: the seduction and destruction of men. But

they have no power over the righteous and over Ismael:-
"And let them not rule over the spirits of the living;
for thou alone canst exercise dominion over them. And
let them not have powerever the sons of the righteous
from henceforth and for evermore." (X.6.).

But this kingdom is merely temporal. In the end
it will vanish, and Satan will lose his worldly power:-
"And there will be no Satan nor any evil destroyer."
(XXIII.29.). This is in the true spirit of apocalyp-
tic teaching, and a happy parallel is to be seen in the
Book of Revelation:- "And he laid hold on the dragon,
that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and
bound him for a thousand years." (XX.2.).

THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS.

In spite of the early date assigned to the composition
of the greater part of this book (Charles....109-106 B.C.),
there is manifested in it a highly-developed doctrine of
the personification of evil. This Person is mentioned
some 37 times, the names employed being either Beliar,
Satan, or the Devil. Of these Beliar is met with most
frequently, occurring no less than 30 times. Referen-
ces to spirits abound everywhere: there are spirits of

envy, fornication, pride, lying, lust, etc.

As in Jubilees, so in the Testaments, the Devil appears as the lord of the spirits --- "And now, fear the Lord, my children, and beware of Satan and his spirits." (Test. Dan, VI.1.). "Seven spirits therefore are appointed against man by Beliar, and they are the leaders in the works of youth." (Test. Reuben, II.2.). He has his angels:- "For the latter ends of men do show their righteousness (or unrighteousness) when they meet the angels of the Lord and of Satan." (Test. Asher, VI.4.). He is full of malevolence, hatred, and deceit. "Therefore, my children, flee the malice of Beliar." (Test. Benjamin, VII.1.). "For the spirit of hatred worketh together with Satan, through hastiness of spirit, in all things unto men's death." (Test. Gad, IV.7.).

He is the very antithesis of God and of all virtue. "As his soul, so also is his word either in the law of the Lord or in the law of Beliar." (Test. Naphtali, II. 6.). "Choose, therefore, for yourselves either the light or the darkness, either the law of the Lord or the works of Beliar." (Test. Levi, XIX.1.). Here, and more especially in the opposition of light and darkness, we find traces of a dualism strongly reminiscent of the Persian system. But as with all apocalyptic

literature, it is an immediate, rather than an ultimate, dualism. There must come a time when the Devil will at last be conquered, when the powers of good and light will reign supreme.

This ultimate victory is stressed in many passages of the Testaments:- "And ye shall be the people of the Lord, and have one tongue; and there shall be there no spirit of deceit of Beliar, for he shall be cast into the fire for ever." (Test. Judah, XXV. 3.). "And in the second are the hosts of the armies which are ordained for the day of judgment, to work vengeance on the spirits of deceit and of Beliar." (Test. Levi, III.3.). To bring about this final defeat God will employ his armies of the good spirits:- "And there shall arise unto you from the tribe of Levi the salvation of the Lord; and he shall make war against Beliar, and execute an everlasting vengeance on our enemies. And the captivity shall he take from Beliar, and turn disobedient hearts unto the Lord, and give to them that call upon him eternal peace." (Test. Dan, V.10,11.).

Again, that the dualism of the Testaments is by no means complete is revealed conclusively in several passages which indicate that Beliar can do no real harm to the righteous of Israel. Men have their prophylactic

against the attacks of the Devil: they must observe the Law and live in accordance with the dictates of righteousness. "So do ye also these things, my children, and every spirit of Beliar shall flee from you, and no deed of wicked men shall rule over you." (Test. Issachar, VII.7.). "And even though the spirits of Beliar claim you to afflict you with every evil, yet shall they not have dominion over you." (Test. Benjamin, III.3.).

Great emphasis is laid on fornication as being the transgression which most surely places a man beneath the sway of Satan. "For fornication is the mother of all evils, separating from God, and bringing near to Beliar." (Test. Simeon, V.5.). "For if fornication overcomes not your mind, neither can Beliar overcome you." (Test. Reuben, IV.11.).

But the mere observance of the law is not the sole safeguard against the onslaughts of the Devil; there is also prescribed that regulation of conduct which more closely accords with the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount. "For he that feareth God and loveth his neighbour cannot be smitten by the spirit of the air of Beliar." (Test. Benjamin, III. 4.). "Depart

from wrath, and hate lying, that the Lord may dwell among you, and Beliar may flee from you." (Test. Dan, V.1.).

In the Testaments there emerges once again a conception, already observed in Ecclesiasticus, and later to be seen in the Talmud, that Satan and the 'evil imagination' of Rabbinic psychology are intimately connected. In the Testament of Asher we find what is regarded as being the earliest mention of the 'good inclination' in Jewish literature. "Two ways hath God given to the sons of men, and two inclinations, two kinds of actions, and two modes (of action) and two issues.----- For there are two ways of good and evil, and with these are the two inclinations in our breasts discriminating them."(I. 3,5.). It is for the soul to choose which of these two inclinations it will follow. But if the 'evil inclination' is allowed to have the domination, then Beliar will have the domination. "For (the soul), having its thoughts set upon righteousness, and casting away wickedness, it straightway overthroweth the evil, and uprooteth the sin. But if it incline to the evil inclination, all its actions are in wickedness, and it driveth

away the good, and cleaveth to the evil, and is ruled by Beliar; even though it work what is good, he perverteth it to evil." (I. 7,8.). Elsewhere a similar attitude is manifested:- "For they that are double-faced serve not God, but their own lusts, so that they may please Beliar and men like unto themselves." (Test. Asher, III.2.). "The inclination of the good man is not in the power of the deceit of the spirit of Beliar, for the angel of peace guideth his soul." (Test. Benjamin, VI.1.).

It has already been noted, in our study of Jubilees, that there were ascribed to the Devil certain apparently incongruous actions on the part of God as recorded in the Old Testament. In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs we meet with an interesting development of this tendency, for now we have ascribed to Satan and his spirits the evil conduct of some Old Testament characters. A good example is furnished by the story of Joseph's brethren as narrated in Genesis XXXVII. They, we read, were angry with Joseph and resolved to kill him. "And they said one to another, Behold, this dreamer cometh. Come now therefore, and let us slay him." (verses 19,20.). Here no individuals are mentioned by name, but in the Testaments of Zebulun and

Dan it is definitely stated that Dan was responsible for this attempt on his brother's life. This reflects a tradition probably based on the harsh denunciation of Dan in the so-called Blessing of Jacob. "Dan shall be a serpent by the way, an adder in the path, that biteth the horse heels, so that his rider shall fall backward." (Genesis XLIX.17.). It should also be noted in this connection that no mention is made of the tribe of Dan at the sealing of the servants of the Lord in the Book of Revelation (Chap. VII.).

But, according to the Testaments, Dan was not entirely to blame: he was not altogether responsible for his actions and thoughts. "I confess, therefore, this day to you my children, that I resolved in my heart on the death of Joseph, my brother, the true and good man ----- For the spirit of jealousy and vainglory said to me: Thou thyself also art his son. And one of the spirits of Beliar stirred me up, saying: Take this sword, and with it slay Joseph; so shall thy father love thee when he is dead." (Test. Dan, I. 4-7.).

This attitude towards the ultimate cause of evil again emerges in the treatment of the incident of Joseph and Potiphar's wife. Many fresh details are added to the Genesis story; the woman asserts that she will poison her husband, unless Joseph commits adultery with

her. Joseph deters her from this step by threatening to denounce her publicly. Next she sends him food 'mingled with enchantments,' but Joseph is warned of its dire nature by an apparition. Finally she vows that she will throw herself over a cliff, or that she will hang herself.

All these evil impulses are explained as being due to the suggestions of Beliar. "And when I saw the spirit of Beliar was troubling her, I prayed unto the Lord, and said unto her: Why, wretched woman, art thou troubled and disturbed, blinded through sins?" (Test. Joseph, VII. 4.). Along with this it may not be irrelevant to recollect that, according to Matthew and Luke, a suggestion of suicide features largely in the narrative of the Temptation. And do not the Gadarene swine, when possessed by the 'legion of demons', rush headlong to their death in the Lake?

It must also be mentioned that many of the New Testament writings seem to have been influenced by the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A great many parallels have been collected by Chazelles in the Introduction to his Edition of this book (pp. lxxviii-xcii.), but of these only a few have any important bearing on our investigation. Perhaps the most important is the single reference to the Devil in the Epistle of James:- "Resist the devil,

and he will flee from you" (Ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ
φεύγετε ἀφ' αὐτοῦ) (IV.7.). There seems to be little doubt
that this has been borrowed from the Testaments:- "If
ye work that which is good, my children, both men and
angels shall bless you; and God shall be glorified
among the Gentiles through you, and the devil shall
flee from you" (ὁ διάβολος φεύγει ἀφ' ὑμῶν) (Test.
Naphtali, VIII. 4.). Here the similarity of both
thought and language is too close to be accidental.

Again, the single reference to Beliar in the New
Testament bears a marked resemblance to a passage in
the Testaments:-

"And what communion hath
light with darkness. And
what concord hath Christ
with Beliar?"

(II. Cor. VI.14,15.)

"Choose, therefore, for your
selves either the light or the
darkness, either the law of the
Lord or the works of Beliar."

(Test. Levi, XIX.1.)

In the Epistle to the Ephesians mention is made of
'the prince of the power of the air.' (II.2.). This seems
to reflect the conception underlying a passage in the
Testament of Benjamin:- "For he that feareth God and
loveth his neighbour cannot be smitten by the spirit of
the air of Beliar." (III. 4.....Greek Version B.).

Of the later pre-Christian additions to the Testaments
little need be said, apart from noting that there we have

the earliest reference to any identification of the tribe of Dan with Antichrist. This aspect will be investigated in detail when we come to study the mention of Antichrist in the New Testament. The passage in question runs as follows:- "And whensoever ye (the tribe of Dan) depart from the Lord, ye shall walk in all evil and work the abominations of the Gentiles, going a-whoring after women of the lawless ones, while with all wickedness the spirits of wickedness work in you. For I have read in the book of Enoch, the righteous, that your prince is Satan, and that all the spirits of wickedness and pride will conspire to attend constantly on the sons of Levi, to cause them to sin before the Lord." (Test. Dan, V. 5,6.).

The post-Christian additions to the text manifest the idea that the Suffering Messiah will be the instrument of Satan's downfall. "And a sinless man shall die for ungodly men, in the blood of the covenant, for the salvation of the Gentiles and of Israel, and shall destroy Beliar and his servants." (Test. Benjamin, III. 8.). "And healing and compassion shall be in his wings. He shall redeem all the captivity of the sons of men from Beliar; and every spirit of deceit shall be trodden down." (Test. Zebulon, IX.8.).

THE PSALMS OF SOLOMON.

The writing of these eighteen Psalms is generally ascribed by scholars to the period 70 - 40 B.C. They presuppose a state of society, and reflect conceptions, which are entirely compatible with the conditions of the middle of the first century before the Christian era. There seems to be but little doubt that we have references to Pompey's excesses in Palestine. This is most important, not merely because it enables us to furnish these Psalms with a 'terminus a quo,' but on account of the way in which these references are phrased. For although the allusions are to an ordinary human being, yet they could easily be interpreted of some superhuman being.

Here we touch upon the fringe of an important phase of our investigations. Do some of our later references, sometimes interpreted of the Devil, actually refer to the human or the superhuman? This question will have to be discussed when we examine such problems as the Beliar myth, the Antichrist myth, and the Nero Redivivus myth. The passage in the Psalms of Solomon runs as follows:-
"The lawless one laid waste our land so that none inhabited it, they destroyed young and old and their children together. In the heat of his anger he sent them away

even unto the west, and he exposed the rulers of the land unsparingly to derision. Being an alien the enemy acted proudly, and his heart was alien from our God." (XVII. 13-15.). In verse 13 we are regarding the reading ἄνεμος as being the original. This is found in the Codex Vaticanus, Codex Iberiticus, and a Codex of the Laura Monastery on Mount Athos. An additional support for this reading has been supplied by the Syriac Version, published by Rendle Harris in 1909: this reads ܐܢܝܡܐ . The alternative reading ὁ ἄνεμος --- the tempest --- found in most Greek MSS was adopted by Ryle and James in their edition of the Psalms of Solomon published in 1891.

In a later section that difficult question of the identity of Antichrist will have to be investigated. All that need be said here is that in II. Thessalonians we have the term ὁ ἄνεμος used of Antichrist. "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." (II.8.). In verse 3 of this same chapter we find that certain important MSS give a reading which describes the Antichrist as

being "the man of lawlessness." The really important point of all this is that in the past some have interpreted this passage as referring to Satan: others to Antichrist. But only a few of the latter have been willing to regard the Antichrist as being some foreign monarch or leader. Surely their position is rendered much more tenable when this passage from the Psalms of Solomon is read alongside it? For here at last we have references to a foreign leader - Pompey - and here we have him spoken of as 'the lawless one,' the very same expression as that found in II. Thessalonians.

Additional light is thrown on this problem when we observe that, in an earlier passage of the Psalms of Solomon, Pompey is mentioned as 'the dragon.' "Delay not, O God, to recompense them on their heads, to turn the pride of the dragon into dishonour." (II.29.). It is not without significance that this word (δράκων) should occur frequently in the Book of Revelation, a book in which the dragon-myth features largely, and where the possibilities of it referring to some earthly individual are by no means remote.

The other remaining point of interest in the Psalms of Solomon is that the serpent of the Fall-story is mentioned. "And their (the sinners') eyes are fixed upon

any man's house that is still secure, that they may, like the Serpent, destroy wisdom, speaking with the words of transgressors." (IV.11.). Here we may note the absence of any attempt to associate, or to identify, the serpent with Satan. The metaphor would appear to be undoubtedly based upon the temptation in the garden of Eden; but it is impossible to suggest that any of the later refinements added to the story of Genesis III. are presupposed in this passage.

THE FRAGMENTS OF A ZADOKITE WORK.

Written at an uncertain date, but probably between 18 and 8 B.C., this little book "represents the beliefs and expectations of a body of reformers who sprang up in the second century B.C. within the priesthood, and called themselves, at all events in the first century, 'the sons of Zadok.' This party - 'the penitents of Israel' - appears to have attempted the reform of irregularities connected with the Temple, but having failed in the attempt they left Jerusalem and the cities of Israel, either voluntarily or under compulsion, and withdrew to Damascus under the leadership of 'the Star', otherwise designated as the 'Lawgiver', where they est-

ablished the 'New Covenant' -- 'the Covenant of Repentance.'" (Charles, "Between the Old and New Testaments, page 234.).

In this book we find many bitter attacks on the Pharisees. There is a marked tendency to ascribe to the Prophets as much importance as to the Law. And this must be the written Law: the oral has no value. Divorce is forbidden; and the highest of ethical standards is maintained. It was this emphasis which the Zadokites laid on lofty ethical ideals which led them to attach such weight to the Prophets. "Their attitude in this respect is nearer that of the Sermon on the Mount than that of any other party in Judaism." (Charles, "Fragments of a Zadokite Work", in Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. Vol.II.p.796.)

As in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch and other writings, the origin of sin is traced back to the Watchers, fallen angels who fell through sexual lust. And here it must be emphasised that the conception of this book approximates more closely to that of the rest of Enoch rather than to the Pseudepigrapha. The theory that the fall of the Watchers was due to fornication is not altogether original, for a similar theory finds expression in the Testament of Reuben --- "Flee, therefore, fornication -----

because every woman who useth these wiles hath been reserved for eternal punishment. For thus they allured the Watchers who were before the flood, etc." (V.5.). Some few refinements are added to the Watcher-story, such as the wildly exaggerated height of the giants.

Again, along with the 'eyes full of fornication' are coupled, as being responsible for this fall, the 'thoughts of an evil imagination.' The original Hebrew text here reads עֵינָיו מְלֵאִים זָכָר, but this, of course, is the equivalent of the זָכָר וְהַיְיָ of Ecclesiasticus and the Rabbinic writings. The following is the passage in the Zadokite Fragments dealing with this subject:- "To walk uprightly in all his ways, and not to go about in the thoughts of an evil imagination and with eyes full of fornication. For many were led astray by them, and mighty men of valour stumbled by them from of old until this day. Because they walked in the stubbornness of their heart the Watchers of heaven fell. By these (i.e. evil thoughts) were they caught because they kept not the commandments of God. And their children whose height was like the loftiness of the cedars, and whose bodies were like the mountains, fell thereby. All flesh that was on dry land perished thereby, and they were as though they had

not been. Because they did their own will, and kept not the commandment of their Maker, until his wrath was kindled against them."(III.2-7.).

The Devil is never called Satan in the Zadokite Fragments. On one occasion he is named Mastema, a title almost entirely peculiar to the Book of Jubilees, the only other known writing in which it occurs being the Acts of Philip. It is perfectly obvious that the writers of the Zadokite Fragments have borrowed this title from Jubilees, as may be seen from the following quotation:- "And as for the exact statement of their periods to put Israel in remembrance in regard to all these, behold, it is treated accurately in the Book of the Divisions of the Seasons according to their Jubilees and their Weeks. And on the day on which the man imposes it upon himself to return to the Law of Moses, the angel of Mastema will depart from him if he make good his word. Therefore Abraham was circumcised on the day of his knowing it." (XX. 1-3.).

But the name for Satan generally used in the Zadokite Fragments is Belial. This does not occur in the Ethiopic Enoch, although it is common, in the form Beliar, throughout the Book of Jubilees and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Some new and interesting details are added

to the conception of Satan. "And during all these years Belial shall be let loose against Israel, as God spake through Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amos, saying: 'Fear and the pit and the snare are upon thee, O inhabitant of the land.' This means the three nets of Belial, concerning which Levi the son of Jacob spake, by which he caught Israel and directed their faces to three kinds of wickedness (a conjectural emendation suggested by Charles). The first is fornication, the second is the wealth, the third is the pollution of the Sanctuary." (VI. 9-11.).

While investigating this passage it is impossible to pass over the expression of a tendency which has been observed in the attitude of other writers, viz: to see references to the Devil in passages of the Old Testament where, in the original, no such reference exists. All Isaiah (XXIV.17.) did was to mention 'fear and the pit and the snare;' it is mere conjecture on the part of the writers of the Zadokite Fragments to assert that these three are the 'nets of Belial.' It was not unknown in Jewish literature that a triad of deadly sins should be enumerated, as in Jubilees VII.20, but the list given in this present passage is not found elsewhere.

These 'nets of Belial' may reasonably be compared with the 'snare of the devil' mentioned in the New Testament.

"Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without: lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil." (I. Timothy, III.7.). "And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will." (II. Timothy, II.26.).

Reminiscent of the teaching of Jubilees, we find that in the Zadokite Fragments the Devil is held to have been responsible for the magical acts performed by Pharaoh's enchanters. "For aforetime arose Moses and Aaron through the prince of the Enights. But Belial raised Jochanneh and his brother with his evil device when the former delivered Israel." (VII.19.). Attention should be paid to the development here. The magicians numbered two, and they were brothers. One of them, Jochanneh, is even mentioned by name. They seem to have been contemporary literary figures of some popularity, but when they appear in the Talmud (Babylonian) they are called Yochani and Mamre. We meet with them also in the New Testament, where the name of the second is given as Jambres. "Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith." (II. Timothy, III.7,8.).

In a similar manner those who engage in witchcraft and necromancy are regarded as being under the sway of Belial. Although these practises were emphatically forbidden in the Old Testament, it is in the Zadokite Fragments that we first read of these black arts being associated with the Devil; although we may see the germs of such a conception in Jubilees, where Mastema aids the Egyptian enchanter. The passage of the Zadokite Fragments which reflects this highly-developed conception runs as follows:- "Any man who is ruled by the spirits of Belial and speaks rebellion shall be judged by the judgement of the necromancer and wizard." (XIV.5.).

While investigating the teaching embodied in the Parables of the Ethiopic Enoch, attention was drawn to the fact that one of the functions of the Satans was the punishment of sinners. In the Zadokite Fragments also we find that a similar function has been allotted to Belial. "And this also shall be the judgment of all them who have entered into his covenant, who will not hold fast to these statutes: they shall be visited for destruction through the hand of Belial." (IX.12.). Here again we may direct our thoughts to those two passages in the Epistles which speak of the handing over of sinners to Satan for punishment (I. Corinthians, V.5., I. Tim. I.20.).

THE ASSUMPTION OF MOSES.

This title seems to be somewhat of a misnomer. Written in Hebrew between 7 and 29 A.D., and translated into Greek during the same period, the original Assumption of Moses is suspected - on very good grounds - of having consisted of two parts. These were the Testament of Moses and the Assumption of Moses. Of the two the latter has been lost, and what has come down to us, by means of a fifth century Latin version, is not the Assumption, but the Testament of Moses.

In the latter there is little which has any bearing on our investigations. The Devil is mentioned on one occasion only, and here he is given the name of Satan. The problem, of course, arises as to what is the exact connotation which the writer has assigned to the term. Does he wish to indicate some Testing Angel -- a figure akin to that appearing in Job and Zechariah, --- or have we here the Supreme Enemy of Mankind? At first sight it would seem hard to decide this question: but the difficulties begin to vanish when we note that we are dealing, not with prose, but with poetry --- poetry once written in Hebrew, and con-

taining a strongly-marked parallelism. The following is the passage:- "And then his kingdom will appear throughout all his creation, and then Satan will be no more, and sorrow will depart with him." (X.1.). The fact that the destruction of Satan is automatically followed by the destruction of sorrow strongly suggests that Satan here indicates something much more baneful than any Testing Angel. We have in this passage a conception which harmonises completely with that of most of the apocalyptic and pseudepigraphic literature.

But for us the original Assumption of Moses is of the greatest importance. True, as an entity, it does not now exist. But from many quotations and references in early Christian literature scholars have been able to reconstruct a fair amount of the Greek text. It is from this lost Assumption of Moses that the Epistle of Jude derives a strange passage about Satan disputing with Michael. "Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." (Jude, 9.).

Dr. Charles, in his 'Assumption of Moses' (PP 105-110), has made a brilliant reconstruction of the original

passage, bringing together all the scattered quotations and references. We cannot do better than to quote fully from his book:-

"Now, judging from the surviving Greek fragments, which we shall give in extenso presently, the order of the action in the original Assumption was probably as follows:-

- (1). Michael is commissioned to bury Moses.
- (2). Satan opposes his burial, and that on two grounds.
 - (a). First he claims to be the lord of matter (hence the body should be handed over to him). To this claim Michael rejoins: "The Lord rebuke thee, for it was God's spirit that created the world and all mankind." (Hence not Satan, but God, was the lord of matter).
 - (b). Secondly, Satan brings the charge of murder against Moses. (The answer to this charge is wanting.)
- (3). Having rebutted Satan's accusations, Michael then proceeds to charge Satan with having inspired the serpent to tempt Adam and Eve.
- (4). Finally, all opposition having been overcome, the Assumption takes place in the presence of Joshua and Caleb, and in a very peculiar way. A twofold presentation of Moses appears 'living in the spirit,' which is carried up to heaven: the other is the dead body of Moses, which is buried in the mountains.

This sketch is founded, as we have observed, on quotations and references occurring in St. Jude and subsequent writers, etc."

So much for Dr. Charles' brilliant reconstruction. It now remains for us to investigate some of the underlying conceptions from the viewpoint of our own special study. In the first place, it is more than significant that Satan should suggest that he was the 'Lord of Matter.' It seems obvious that there were at least some individuals at this time who held such a theory. Not that it is difficult to understand how they arrived at such a position. From time to time, from Persia, there had been the fortuitous filtration of dualism - that system which strives to explain the universe in terms of a conflict between Good and Evil, Light and Darkness, Spirit and Matter. And for those who accepted to the full the theory that matter was evil, it was but a slight and logical transition to make the head of the kingdom of evil into the lord of matter. But that such a view was contrary to that held by the majority of men is obvious from the manner in which Satan's arguments are refuted.

In the second place, we are given some interesting details as to how Satan was responsible for the Fall. He is not identified with the serpent: but he is stated to have inspired it. This is clear from the reference in Origen:- "Et primo quidem in Genesi serpens Evam seduxisse describitur, de quo in Adscensione Mosis, cujus libelli meminet in epistola sua apostolus Judas, Michael archangelus cum diabolo disputans de corpore Mosis ait, a diabolo inspiratum serpentem causam existisse praevaricationis Adae et Evae." (De Princip: III. 2. 1.). This conception of the serpent being, as it were, the mouthpiece of the Devil is not uncommon in later thought. As an example we may quote a passage from the Revelation of Moses:- "And the devil spoke to the serpent, saying, Arise, come to me, and I shall tell you a thing in which thou mayest be of service.....And the serpent says to him, I am afraid lest the Lord be angry with me. The devil says to him, Be not afraid, only become my instrument, and I will speak through thy mouth a word by which thou shalt be able to deceive him." (translation from Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. XVI.).

In the third place, it is impossible not to be struck by the fact that, during this apocalyptic period,

it was not easy for anyone to write a targum or midrash on any passage of the Old Testament without introducing the figure of Satan. Even such an innocuous, though intriguing, story as that of the mysterious disposal of the remains of Moses, has to be given a Satan-content; and the angels, generally present in the background whenever Satan is mentioned, are duly brought on the stage. But this is one of the greatest characteristics of the apocalyptic literature.

It may be that some will question this influence of the Assumption of Moses upon the Epistle of Jude. To obviate the possibility of any further doubts, we shall now give yet a further proof of this influence. On this occasion, it will be observed, we are discovering parallels, not in the lost Assumption, but in the existing Testament. For the sake of clarity, we shall give the two passages in parallel.

"These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts: and their mouth speaketh great swelling words, having men's persons in admiration because of advantage."

Epistle of Jude ver. 16

"Quaerulosi(VII.7.) et manus eorum et mentes immunda tractantes, et os eorum loquetur ingenia(VII.9.) mirantes personas locupletum et accipientes munera(V.5.)"

Assumption of Moses.

These parallels are too close to leave room for any doubt.

Some scholars, including Dr. Charles, have discovered other instances in the Epistle of Jude where traces of the

Assumption of Moses are seemingly to be observed. Thus, the 'mockers' of verse 18 seem to be the 'homines pestilentiosi' (Assump. VII.3.). The 'ungodly men' of verse 4 find a parallel in the 'impii' of the Assumption (VII.3,7.) With reference to these phenomena, Dr. Charles writes as follows:- "Now, lest ~~we~~ the full force of these parallels should escape us, we should observe that the accounts in both books are nominally prophetic. The classes of evil-doers dealt with are those who shall be 'in the last time' according to Jude 18, and 'when the times are ended,' in our text." ("The Assumption of Moses", pp. lxii-lxiii.).

THE SLAVONIC BOOK OF ENOCH.

Generally known as the Book of the Secrets of Enoch, this writing has come down to us only in its Slavonic form. We have therefore adopted the title Slavonic Enoch, in order that there may be no confusion between it and that other collection of writings known as the Ethiopic Enoch. The book is of a composite nature, part having been originally written in Greek, and part in Hebrew. Coming into existence about the beginning of the Christian era, its place of origin seems to have been Egypt, and there can be little doubt as to its final editor having been a Hellenistic Jew.

Its direct influence on the New Testament has been slight; but this cannot be said of its effect upon other writings, as the following quotation --- from Dr. Charles' "Between the Old and New Testaments" --- renders manifest.

"Although the very knowledge that such a book ever existed was lost for probably twelve hundred years, it nevertheless was much used both by Christians and heretics in the early centuries. Thus citations appear from it, though without acknowledgment, in the Books of Adam and Eve, the Apocalypses of Moses and Paul (A.D. 400-500), the Sibylline Oracles, the Ascension of Isaiah and the Epistle of Barnabas (A.D. 70-90.). It is quoted by name in the later portions of the Testaments of Levi, Dan and Naphtali. It was referred to by Origen and probably by Clement of Alexandria, and used by Iraeus, and a few phrases in the New Testament may be derived from it." (p. 240.).

Here we once again meet with the Myth of the Watchers. In substance the old story remains; but in details we can observe many developments. Thus, they are no longer called Watchers: they are the Grigori. This looks back to the Aramaic of Daniel IV., where the Watchers are called

גריגרי. This the LXX regularly renders by ἐγρηγόροισι, a translation which implies not only the idea of watching, but also of sleepless watching. This is but one other

proof of that theorem, so familiar to students of the Old Testament, that the LXX is not so much a literal translation, as a Targum or paraphrase. The idea of sleepless, unceasing watching may be observed in the words of Isaiah: "I have set watchmen ($\text{דַּרְכֵי שָׂמַרְתִּי}$) upon they walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day nor night: ye that amke mention of the Lord, keep not silence. And give him no rest, till he establish, and till he make Jerusalem a praise for ever." (LXII.6,7.).

It is not difficult to understand how the ἑγρηγόροι of the LXX became the Grigori of Slavonic Enoch. The following is the passage which treats of them:- "And the man took me on the fifth heaven and placed me, and there I saw many and countless soldiers, called Grigori, of human appearance, and their size was greater than that of great giants, and their faces withered, and the silence of their mouths perpetual, and there was no service on the fifth heaven, and I said to the men who were with me: 'Wherefore are these withered and their faces melancholy, and their mouths silent, and wherefore is there no service on this heaven?' And they said to me: These are the Grigori, who with their prince Satanail rejected the Lord of Light, and after them are those who are held in great darkness on the second heaven,

and three of them went down from the Lord's throne, to the place Ermon, and broke through their vows on the shoulder of the hill Ermon and saw the daughters of men how good they are, and took to themselves wives, and befouled the earth with their deeds, who in all times of their age made lawlessness and mixing, and giants are born and marvellous big men and great enmity. And therefore God judges them with great judgment, and they weep for their brethren and they will be punished on the Lord's great day. And I said to the Grigori: 'I saw your brethren, and their works, and their great torments, and I prayed for them, but the Lord has condemned them to be under earth till heaven and earth shall end for ever.' And I said: 'Wherefore do you wait, brethren, and do not serve before the Lord's face, and have not put your services before the Lord's face, lest you anger the Lord utterly?' And they listened to my admonition, and spoke to the four ranks in heaven, and lo! as I stood with those two men four trumpets trumpeted together with great voice, and the Grigori broke into song with one voice, and their voice went up before the Lord pitifully and affectingly." (XVIII.).

Here there are reflected many developments of the Watcher-story which cannot be passed over without due

comment. The Watchers themselves are of abnormal stature and a human appearance: whereas in earlier writings these have been the characteristics of their offspring, after their intercourse with the daughters of men. They have a leader called Satanail; although in the Ethiopic Enoch his name was given as Semiaza, and there he was a Watcher, but not a Satan. Again, the Grigori of this present writing have less in common with the Watchers of Ethiopic Enoch VI + XVI than they have with the Satans of the Parables of Enoch. The Grigori rebelled against God, but it was the angels who went down to sin with the daughters of men. Although the same locality is mentioned, viz: Mount Hermon, there is a grave discrepancy in the records of the actual number of these angels. Ethiopic Enoch specifies two hundred: Slavonic Enoch only three. For these fallen angels there is to be no respite; they have been condemned beneath the earth until heaven and earth shall end for ever.

Some estimate may be formed of the influence exerted by this passage from the fact that a later addition to the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs makes a direct reference to it, at the same time providing useful evidence that Satan and Satanail were regarded as being

identical. "For I have read in the book of Enoch, the righteous, that your prince is Satan, and that all the spirits of wickedness and pride will conspire to attend constantly on the sons of Levi, to cause them to sin before the Lord." (Test. Dan, V.6.).

The central portion of Slavonic Enoch consists largely of an address by God to Enoch. In the course of this address there is given some sort of a paraphrase of the Creation-story, and we find the following account of the forming of the angels. "And from the rock I cut off a great fire, and from the fire I created the orders of the incorporeal ten troops of angels, and their weapons are fiery and their raiment a burning flame, and I commanded that each one should stand in his order. And one from out the order of angels, having turned away with the order that was under him, conceived an impossible thought, to place his throne higher than the clouds above the earth, that he might become equal in rank to my power. And I threw him out from the height with his angels, and he was flying in the air continuously above the bottomless." (XXIX.3-5.).

Here the 'one from out the order of angels' must evidently mean Satan or Satanail: in punishment for

his rebellion, he and his angels were cast down from heaven, and were given the air for their habitation. This is strictly in accordance with a popular belief of contemporary Judaism, such as we have already observed in our study of the Testament of Benjamin:-

"For he that feareth God and loveth his neighbour cannot be smitten by the spirit of the air of Beliar, being shielded by the fear of God."(III.4.). It is to the kingdom of the air that Satan and his demons are relegated, a conception which we shall see manifesting itself in the Ascension of Isaiah. This idea is not absent from the New Testament: the Epistle to the Ephesians mentions the 'prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience.'(II.2.).

Here it should be noted that at a much later date Athanasius, in his work "De Incarnatione," stressed the extreme suitability of crucifixion as a death, inasmuch as no other form of death could have extended salvation to the demons. This argument can have no force unless it is recognised that the air was regarded as the demons' special domain.

"And once more, if the devil, the enemy of our race, having fallen from heaven, wanders about our lower atmosphere, and there bearing rule over his fellow-spirits, as his peers in disobedience, not only works illusions by their means in them that are deceived, but tries to hinder them that are going up (and about this the Apostle says: 'According to ~~him~~ the prince of the power of the air, of the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience'); while the Lord came to cast down the devil, and clear the way for us into heaven, as said the Apostle: "Through the veil, that is to say, his flesh" - and this must needs be by death - well, by what other kind of death could this have come to pass, than by one which took place in the air, I mean the cross? For only he that is perfected on the cross dies in the air. Whence it was quite fitting that the Lord suffered this death. For being thus lifted up he cleared the air of the malignity both of the devil and of demons of all kinds, as he says: 'I beheld Stan as lightning fall from heaven.'" (De Incarnatione, XXV.5,6. --- translated by Robertson.).

We may also note that Satan is said to have 'thought to place his throne higher than the clouds above the earth.' When we observe the following words - 'I threw him out from the height with his angels' - we can well understand how later ages interpreted of Satan a passage

of Isaiah which really refers to the king of Babylon:-

"How art thou fallen from heaven, O day star, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which did weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thy heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God ----- I will ascend above the heights of the clouds: I will be like the Most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit." (Isaiah, XIV. 13-15.). It may well be that this passage from Slavonic Enoch may help us in interpreting some words of our Lord, recorded by St. Luke only:- "I beheld Satan as lightning falling from heaven." (X.18.).

God goes on to tell Enoch about the creation of man. The Genesis story is not followed with any great attention to detail, and man's gift of free-will is stressed. "I called his name Adam, and showed him the two ways, the light and the darkness, and I told him: 'This is good, and that bad,' that I should learn whether he has love towards me or hatred, that it be clear which in his race love me." (XXX.15.). This attitude should be contrasted with the Genesis story, where a knowledge of good and evil is held to be due to the eating of the fruit of the tree.

In the Fall-story we find a clear indication of the identification of Satan and the serpent. The motive of

Satan appears to have been envy. "And he (Adam) was continuously in paradise, and the devil understood that I want to create another world, because Adam was lord on earth, to rule and control it. The devil is the evil spirit of the lower places, as a fugitive he made, he made Sotona from the heavens as his name was Sato-mail, thus he became different from the angels, but his nature did not change his intelligence so far as his understanding of righteous and sinful things. And he understood his condemnation and the sin which he had sinned before, therefore he conceived thought against Adam, in such form he entered and seduced Eva, but did not touch Adam." (XXXI.3-6.).

This identification of Satan with the serpent should be carefully compared with a similar reference to the Fall-story in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch. Some difference in details will be observed, the most important of these being that in Ethiopic Enoch it is Gadreel, who is one of the Satans. But he is not Satan himself; for Satan is the head of the Satans. In Slavonic Enoch, on the other hand, it is not one of the Satans who seduces Eve: it is Satanail - Satan himself. This then is the first occasion on which we can note a complete identification of the two, unless we regard Wisdom II.24 as indicating such an identification.

The conclusion that Slavonic Enoch manifests a certain amount of dualism is inevitable. At the same time it must be recognised that this dualism is far from being absolute. There is no propounding of the theory that matter is evil, something belonging to that world which is opposed to all that is spiritual, all that is God. On the contrary, we meet with an unqualified denial of this: there is a definite assertion that God created all things. "For the Lord created all things. Bow not down to things made by man, leaving the Lord of all creation, because no work can remain hidden before the Lord's face." (LXVI.5.). With this we may well contrast that dualism of the Gnostics, which was so complete in its attitude towards the evil of matter that the existence of a Demiurge had to be postulated, that the reality of our Lord's earthly body had to be questioned. We may also contrast that position revealed in the lost Assumption of Moses, where Satan claims to be the 'Lord of Matter.' The Slavonic Enoch will have none of this: the Great Architect is also the Great Builder.

THE SIBYLLINE BOOKS.

These writings contain but little which has any bearing on our investigations. There is, however, one passage which is of the greatest importance:-

"From the stock of Sebaste Beliar shall come in later time and shall raise the mountain heights and raise the sea, the great fiery sun and the bright moon, and he shall raise up the dead and shall perform many signs for men: but they shall not be effective in him."(Book III. 63-67.).

The word Beliar or Belial has been met with frequently in the apocalyptic literature, but on previous occasions it has had the connotation of an evil angel or some personification of evil. Now, on the contrary, it denotes some historical personage.

As to the identity of this historical personage, much speculation has existed. Many scholars, including Dr. Charles, have seen in this passage a reference to Nero. The words 'from the stock of Sebaste' - (ἐκ τοῦ Σεβαστεῖος) - naturally suggest the line of Augustus.

On the other hand, some have interpreted these words of Simon Magus. Sebaste is taken as indicating Samaria, where, according to the Acts of the Apostles

(VIII.9ff.), Simon flourished. This magician occupies a prominent position in the Acts of Peter and Paul.

Here he is made to perform many amazing feats, and Nero says of him:- "Do you mean me to believe that Simon does not know these things, who both raised a dead man, and presented himself on the third day after he had been beheaded, and who has done whatever he said he would do."

(Translation from the Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. XVI. p.266.). To this supposed raising of the dead we find a good parallel in the words of the passage which we have quoted:- "And he shall raise up the dead and shall perform many signs for men."

We do not propose to investigate any further, at this point, the identity of Beliar in this context. Such an investigation must needs be made in some detail in the course of our examination of the Antichrist Legend. Suffice it now to say that here we seem to have good grounds for suspecting that the reference is to some historical personage; that the word Belial in this passage exhibits the same phenomena which we observed in our study of the 'lawless one' in the Psalms of Solomon. And just as we found a use of the expression 'lawless one' in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, so too will we find an occurrence of Beliar in

II. Corinthians VI.15. --- "And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?"

THE SYRIAC APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH.

This is a composite work, consisting of writings which belong to the period 50 - 90 A.D. Its importance lies in the fact that it illustrates those beliefs and attitudes of Judaism which were prevalent at the time when most of the New Testament books were coming into being. The production of a group of Pharisees, it is partly an apology for Judaism, and partly an 'implicit polemic against Christianity.'

Its doctrine of sin inclines more to that of the Slavonic Enoch than to that of Ethiopic Enoch and Jubilees. Man possesses free-will, and sin is a conscious and willing breach with the dictates of the law. Sin begins with the fall of Adam: in its train it brings the legacy of death. "For what did it profit Adam that he lived nine hundred and thirty years, and transgressed that which he was commanded? Therefore the multitude of time that he lived did not profit him, but brought death and cut off the years of those who were born from him." (XVII.2,3.). "Because when Adam sinned and death was

decreed against him and those who should be born, then the multitude of those who should be born was numbered, and for that number a place was prepared where the living might dwell and the dead might be guarded."(XXIII.4.).

This doctrine of the fall of man is of vast importance to those who would interpret aright certain passages of the New Testament. Physical death is the result of man's fall; the serpent is the agent through whom this fall was effected; therefore the serpent is, indirectly, the agent through whom death became man's heritage. But although Satan and the serpent are nowhere identified in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, such an identification is, as we have seen, not unknown in other apocalyptic writings. By a simple conflation of these two conceptions, it is not difficult to arrive at the conclusion that Satan is responsible for physical death. An attitude of this nature is to be observed in the Epistle to the Hebrews --- the only reference to the Evil One in this epistle --- "That through death he might bring to nought him that hath the power of death, that is the devil." (II.14.). A somewhat similar conception may be reflected in a difficult passage in the Fourth Gospel:- "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning."(VIII.44.). But the reference here may

be to the murder of Abel by Cain, and not to the fall of Adam.

Not only is physical death to be traced back to the sin of Adam, but also all those other banes which beset mortal life. It is to this that grief, pain, and disease, are all due. "For since when he transgressed, untimely death came into being, grief was named and anguish was prepared, and pain was created, and trouble consummated, and disease began to be established, and Sheol kept demanding that it should be renewed in blood, and the begetting of children was brought about, and the passion of parents produced, and the greatness of humanity was humiliated, and goodness languished." (LVI.6.).

Yet in spite of all this, man still continues to be endowed with the gift of free-will. The results of the Fall tend to be physical rather than moral. "For though Adam first sinned and brought untimely death upon all, yet of those who were born from him, each one of them has prepared for his own soul torment to come, and again each one of them has chosen for himself glories to come." (LIV.15.). "Adam is, therefore, not the cause, save only of his own soul, but each of us has been the Adam of his own soul." (LIV.19.).

Having thus observed the stress laid on the fall of Adam, the question now arises as to what part, if any,

Satan played in this fall. One point is clear: in no passage in this book is Satan said to have been identical with the serpent, nor is he said to have used the serpent as his mouthpiece. One passage is worthy of quotation as illustrating this truth. "And I answered and said: 'O Adam, what hast thou done to all those who are born from thee? And what will be said to the first Eve who hearkened to the serpent? For all the multitude are going to corruption, nor is there any numbering of those whom the fire devours.'" (XLVIII. 42,43.). These last few words are important, being the only passage in the book which suggests that spiritual death can be attributed to the fall of Adam and Eve.

Here, it will have been observed, we have no reference to any personification of evil, either explicit or implied. The same holds good of the entire Apocalypse. In a similar way we find that demons and angels have been relegated to the background, although in Baruch's dirge over Jerusalem there are some slight references to popular demons. "But as for us who live, woe unto us, because we see the afflictions of Zion, and what has befallen Jerusalem. I will call the Sirens from the sea, and ye Lilin, come ye from the desert, and ye

Shedim and dragons from the forests."(X.7.8.).

These ~~were~~ familiar terms in contemporary Judaism. They had been found in the Old Testament possessing, perhaps, a connotation which was rather more animal than demonic. But the passing of the years, and man's irrepressible tendency to multiply demons, had resulted in an obliteration of the animal connotation. Thus, taking the word 'siren' we find that the LXX uses it as a translation for ostriches and jackals. But by the time of the Greek Version of Ethiopic Enoch it is used of the ultimate state of those daughters of men who sinned with the angels. "And the women also of the angels who went astray shall become sirens." (Eth. Enoch, XIX.2.).

The Lilin, in the figure of Lilith, appear in the Book of Isaiah; a Sumerian word, it has nothing to do with the Hebrew word for 'night' (לַיִל), although the 'activity of this female monster was greatest at night, and so the rendering 'night-monster' in the Revised Version is not without justification. Lilith haunted the lives of generations of Jews, to judge from the enormous literature which has been devoted to circumventing her evil. In fact, in later Jewish demonology she appears to have given her name to a class of demons (lilin.)" (Guillaume, 'Prophecy and Divination,' page 265.).

Some of the Rabbis thought that Lilith was Adam's

first wife, and she proved to be such a vixen that her human husband could not live with her, with the result that she became the Devil's consort. It may here be noted that the Lilith-myth is still not altogether dead, for she is mentioned in Bernard Shaw's "Back to Methuselah," when the Serpent says:- "Listen. I am old. I am the old serpent, older than Eve. I remembered Lilith, who came before Adam and Eve."

The Shedim ~~were~~ demons, taking their name from a word borrowed from the Assyrian 'sedu' (vide Oxford Hebrew Lexicon). The dragons may look to that dragon-myth to be discussed elsewhere in this study, or they may indicate nothing more than jackals.

In a later section two other strange figures are mentioned. "And it shall come to pass when all is accomplished to come to pass in those parts, that the Messiah shall then begin to be revealed. And Behemoth shall be revealed from his place and Leviathan shall ascend from the sea, those two giant monsters which I created on the fifth day of creation, and shall have kept until that time; and then they shall be for food for all that are left." (XXIX.3,4.). The two are found grouped together in Job --- "Behold now behemoth, which I made

with thee; he eateth grass as an ox." (XL.15.).

"Canst thou draw out leviathan with an hook?" (XLI.1.).

Many interpretations of the meaning of these names have been put forward, including the explanation that they are Egyptian expressions denoting the hippopotamus, etc. But it seems, following Gunkel, that we should rather look for their origin in Babylon, interpreting the phenomena along mythological rather than zoological lines. In future centuries Behemoth and Leviathan became favourite names for demons. Thus, the demons that troubled the Convent of the Ursulines at Loudun in 1634 were called Leviathan, Behemoth, Isacron, and Balam. (vide De Givry, Withcraft, p.165.). One of the world's most amazing documents, purporting to be a letter from Asmodeus himself, dated 1629, mentions as demons Leviathan and Behemoth. (MS. fonds français No. 7618 in the Bibliothèque Nationale.).

But so far as the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch is concerned, there are no indications that the words referred to demons at this period. The content that they were given during the Middle Ages is a good example of how later interpreters have ever tended to

read Satanic or demonic meanings into what were originally perfectly innocuous incidents or words.

THE GREEK APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH.

This also is a composite work, written during the period 50 - 136 A.D. There are definite traces of additions made by some Christian redactor. The influences of the Slavonic Book of Enoch are evident, more especially in the doctrine of man's fall. Its beginnings are traced to Adam's disobedience, this in its turn being due, as in Slavonic Enoch XXXI.3, to the envy of the Devil.

Now we may observe some further developments in the treatment of the Fall-story of Genesis III. First of all there is the question as to what kind of tree it was through which Adam fell. "And I said, I pray thee show me which is the tree which led Adam astray. And the angel said unto me, It is the vine, which the angel Sammael planted, whereat the Lord God was angry, and he cursed him and his plant, while also on this account he did not permit Adam to touch it, and therefore the devil being envious deceived him through his vine." (IV.8.).

A similar belief that the forbidden tree was a vine is to be found in the Talmud (cf. Sanhedrin 70a). And according to R. Aibu, the forbidden fruit which Eve ate was that of the vine (Genesis Rabb. XIX. 8.). The works of Methodius contain what may well be a development of the same idea. Writing on the vine, and on our Lord's words, 'I am the true vine, ye are the branches; and my father is the husbandman,' he distinguishes between two types of vines. "The one is productive of immortality and righteousness; but the other of madness and insanity. The sober and joy-producing vine, from whose instructions, as from branches, there joyfully hang down clusters of graces, distilling love, is our Lord Jesus..... But the wild and death-bearing vine is the devil, who drops down fury and poison and wrath, as Moses relates, writing concerning him, 'For their vine is of the vine of Sodom, and of the fields of Gomorrah,' and therefore it is ordered that a virgin shall not taste of this vine." (The Banquet of the Ten Virgins, V. V.).

The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch introduces us to a new name for Satan. He is called Sammael, although the Slavonic Version reads 'Satanail,' a title already noted in the Slavonic Book of Enoch. Sammael is also

found in the Ascension of Isaiah. In contemporary Judaism he was viewed as being, in his original state, one of the chief archangels. Later, attempting to make the earth his kingdom, he tempted Eve (Jalkut Shim Beresh. 25.). He becomes the chief of the Satans (Debarim Rabb., II.), and the angel of death (Targum Jer. on Genesis III.6.). Sammael was the special foe of Israel (Shem. Rabb., 18.).

Judaism attempted to explain the derivation of the name Sammael from שֶׁמַּמֶּל --- 'the venom of God' --- such a derivation being undoubtedly suggested by the identification of Sammael with the angel of death. Bousset, on the other hand, maintained that the word looked back to the name of the Syrian god Shemal. This is indeed a happy derivation, conforming, as it does, with one of the main canons of the study of Satanology, viz; 'the god of one religion must be the devil of some other religion.'

Sammael, as the incarnation of evil, was the celestial patron of the sinful empire of Rome, with which Esau and Edom were identified (Tan. on Genesis XXXII.35.). He was identified with the angel that wrestled with Jacob (Gen. Rab., LXXVII.), and in the Ascension of Isaiah he is said to have caused the death of that prophet.

Here he is called Sammael Satan:- "On account of these visions and prophecies Sammael Satan sawed in sunder Isaiah the son of Amoz, the prophet, by the hand of Manasseh." (Ascension of Isaiah, XI.41.).

The vine, according to the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch, is evil by reason of its fruit, and the wine derived from it. "Know therefore, O Baruch, that as Adam through this very tree obtained condemnation, and was divested of the glory of God, so also the men who now drink insatiably the wine which is begotten of it, transgress worse than Adam, and are far from the glory of God, and are surrendering themselves to the eternal fire. For no good comes through it. For those who drink it to surfeit do these things: neither does a brother pity his brother, nor a father his son, nor children their parents, but from the drinking of wine come all evils, such as murders, adulteries, perjuries, thefts, and such like. And nothing good is established by it." (IV. 16,17.). It is worthy of note that at this point there exists in the text a Christian interpolation, much more mild in its condemnation of wine. The reason for its insertion is, as has been suggested by Dr. Charles and other scholars, probably due to the use of wine at the Christian Eucharist.

Later in the book we meet with a further reference to the Fall, and here we find that the Devil - in the person of Sammael - and the serpent are identified. No longer is the serpent a separate entity which for the occasion has become the mouthpiece of Sammael. The serpent was Sammael. "And at the transgression of the first Adam, it was near to Sammael when he took the serpent as a garment." (IX. 7.). This reflects a far more highly-developed interpretation of the Fall-story than that which is to be seen in the Ethiopic Enoch. Rather is it of the nature of that complete identification which is seemingly suggested by the Book of Revelation.

With this our survey of the teaching of the Pseud-epigrapha must come to an end. There can be no doubt as to a firmly-established belief in the Devil existing at this time, a Devil that is something far removed from that angel of the Old Testament whose duties were directed by God. Here we have a Devil who is indeed, in the words of our Dictionary definition, "the foe of God and holiness."

And now we must direct our investigations towards the books of the New Testament, ever bearing in mind that the writers, when referring to the Devil, may

have thought either in terms of the conceptions of the Old Testament, or in those of the Pseudepigrapha. It is our business to show that the different writers manifested many varying attitudes towards the idea of the Devil. It will be seen, we trust, that there is little in the nature of any uniform conception running throughout this collection of writings as a whole.

CHAPTER VII.

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

INTRODUCTION.

We do not propose to investigate all four Gospels together, on account of the supposed vein of dualism which pervades the Fourth Gospel. This, therefore, we shall examine in a separate chapter. In our investigations we shall take as our postulates some of the main findings of scholars on the Synoptic Problem. Thus there will be assumed the priority of Mark, the use of Mark by both Matthew and Luke; also their use of some common source other than Mark.

At the outset it is to be observed that various names are to be found for the Evil One: διάβολος , Σατανᾶς , and ὁ πονηρός all occur in these three Gospels. Our difficulties are increased by the fact

that no one of these three terms bears only a single connotation. Satan may be either the Testing Angel of the Old Testament or that altogether evil personality of the current literature of contemporary Judaism. In a similar way διάβολος may have its Classical force of slanderer, or its LXX meaning of enemy; or it might represent the evil Satan of Apocalyptic and current Judaistic literature. Even πονηρός has to be viewed with suspicion: sometimes it must refer to a superhuman Evil One; often it merely indicates an evil human being; and often, when used in either the Genitive or Dative, it may equally well be neuter, meaning either the evil thing or, taken generically, evil itself.

ST. MARK.

Let us begin our investigations with a study of St. Mark. His references to the Devil are surprisingly rare, amounting, as they do, to no more than five. Equally significant is the fact that in the Greek the word Satan is always used; and that of the five references which do exist, four appear in the sayings of our Lord. Most of these seem to have no more baneful connotation than that of the Satan of Job and Zechariah.

The word appears to have been used as a figure of speech to represent the idea of temptation or testing.

No more patently obvious example of this could be found than in the narrative of the confession at Caesarea Philippi. Peter has acknowledged that Jesus was the Christ; there follows a foretelling by Jesus of his future rejection, suffering, and death. "And he spake that saying openly. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him. But when he had turned about, and looked on his disciples, he rebuked Peter, saying, Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men." (VIII.32,33.). Here it is clear that Peter's offence has been his action in being the agent employed by the spirit of temptation: he is to Jesus, what Satan was to Job. Hence our Lord addresses Peter as Satan.

The words in the Greek are:- ὁπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ . The omission of the definite article is perfectly normal in the instance of a proper name employed in the Vocative: there is no justification for suggesting that our Lord was here referring, not to the Satan, but to one of those Satans mentioned in Ethiopic Enoch and contemporary Jewish literature. A similar omission of the definite article is to be observed in the LXX rendering of Zechariah III.

ἐπιτιμῆσαι κύριος ἐν σοί, διάβολε (verse 2.). But this is a possibility which must ever be borne in mind when we are investigating those rare occurrences of the word Σατανᾶς in which it is not in the Vocative Case, and yet lacks the definite article.

Matthew, in this instance, reproduces the words of Mark to the smallest detail (Ὑπαγε ὁπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ, --- Matthew XVI. 23.). Luke, on the other hand, omits these words entirely, probably regarding them as being derogatory to Peter. Several scholars have, however, seen a fair parallel in a statement of our Lord at the incident of the Institution of the Eucharist --- a passage peculiar to St. Luke --- "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat." (Luke XXII.31.). Here, in this Lucan passage, it should be observed that the word Satan is used in a sense closely akin to that of the Old Testament. Perhaps we can also see some sort of a parallel in the Fourth Gospel:- "Did I not choose you the twelve, and one of you is a devil." (John, VI. 70.). The reference here is not, of course, to Peter, but to Judas, against whom the writer of the Fourth Gospel has a most marked animus. Scholars have frequently drawn attention to the unfairness of this Gospel towards Judas, stressing his villainy as it constantly does. The passage which has just been quoted

is most interesting from another point of view, for here, it seems likely, there is to be found a use of διάβολος referring to an earthly individual, yet not bearing its Classical meaning of slanderer. Rather does it imply that the individual in question possesses the quality of hostility, a use of the word which may be seen in the LXX. This passage will of necessity have to be studied in some detail in the course of our investigation of the Fourth Gospel.

Now we must turn our attention to the Marcan version of the Temptation. Jesus, we read, was forty days in the wilderness πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ. What do these words imply? Presumably that Jesus was being tried or tested by the Satan. No details about the form which this trial took are given us by Mark, and we should know but little about this episode had we no access to Matthew and Luke. One fact is obvious; this testing was all part of the Divine plan, and, according to Mark, it was a most essential part which could not be passed over. The use of the extremely strong verb ἐκβάλλω is sufficient evidence of this. But if this testing was part of the Divine plan, then must the agent of the testing have been under Divine direction. The Satan of the Marcan version

of the Temptations approximates most closely to the Satan of Job. A minute examination of this passage convinces us that there is nothing present which in the least partakes of dualism. The Satan here need be no worse a character, no more a personification of supreme evil, than was that Apostle who confessed, "Thou art the Christ" at Caesarea Philippi. But, we may also presume, he had objectionable functions to fulfil, as was the lot of that other Satan in the Old Testament.

In the Greek of this passage, the only occasion on which the term Satan occurs in the narrative of Mark, and not in our Lord's words, we find that the definite article is employed. This is helpful: we are still dealing with one who retains his official characteristics, just as it was the Satan who was entrusted with the trial of Job. We must also pay some attention to the verb *πειράζομαι*, a word which may be used in several different senses. In Classical Greek it generally has a good sense, meaning to make trial of or to test. In the LXX it often has a bad sense, meaning to tempt to evil, or to seduce. At the same time it must be observed that even in the LXX it could have a good sense, and that

frequently enough God himself could be the subject. Examples of this are to be seen in Genesis (XXII.1.), Deuteronomy (IV.34,XIII.3.), Wisdom (III.5.), etc. In view of this, are we entirely justified in following our Authorised and Revised Versions when they render this passage by 'tempted of Satan?' Would it not be safer, seeing that no details are given as to the actual form of good or bad - which these trials took, to render these words by 'being tested by Satan?' It is true that if we were dealing with Matthew's or Luke's versions of the incident, with all their richness of detail as to its unholy nature, we should be justified in translating the word in an evil manner. But we are dealing with the simple narrative of Mark, something far different from those embellished accounts given by the other two Synoptists.

A glance at some synopsis in Greek is sufficient to show that Matthew and Luke were both employing Mark at this point, as well as some other common source. But while employing Mark they have not hesitated to effect some changes, changes which are by no means devoid of significance. The most important of these is that ὁ διάβολος has been substituted by both for the ὁ Σατανᾶς of Mark. Why was this done? May

we suggest that these later writers felt that Mark had been employing too mild a term, that there was a grave danger that this incident might be interpreted along lines similar to those which we have sketched above? For it must be confessed that, in its origins, the word διάβολος had a far more evil connotation than ever belonged to Σατανᾶς . The Temptation narrative of Matthew and Luke is not only much longer than that of Mark; it has also a much more evil ring. This effect could not have been produced so vividly had the word Σατανᾶς been allowed to remain. We must also note that the other common source employed by both Matthew and Luke may have already contained this word διάβολος : the term used by Mark may have been changed to harmonise with that employed by the common source. At the same time, if the latter explanation holds good, it does not explain why no attempt was made to change the word in the common source to make it harmonise with the sentences borrowed from Mark.

A phenomenon of a strikingly cognate nature is to be observed in the incident of the parable of the sower. In our Lord's interpretation of this parable in Mark we read:- "And these are they by the way-side,

where the word is sown; but, when they have heard, Satan cometh immediately, and taketh away the word that was sown in their hearts." (IV.15.). Various interpretations of this passage have been put forward, but that which most naturally suggests itself is that an earthly testing may prove fatal for those who receive the word merely superficially. The fault, as such, seems to rest more with the recipients than with Satan: nevertheless, seeing that his testing was responsible for the vanishing of the word, Satan can indirectly be held responsible for the catastrophe. But the Satan of this passage need not necessarily be any worse than the figure appearing in Job. He cannot be said to have caused the seed to have fallen by the wayside; nor was he responsible for the hard surface of the wayside which gave the seed no protection, which furnished it with no soft surface soil in which to strike its young roots. The other two Synoptists seem to have felt some misgivings about this passage, as is indicated by the changes which they introduce when they employ it. Luke takes over most of the words, but substitutes ὁ διάβολος for ὁ Σατανᾶς, thereby manifesting that for him the former word possessed a more evil meaning than the latter. He

evidently wishes to introduce not only an idea of opposition or testing, but of an actually hostile and active opposition. And here it may be remarked that διάβολος is a favourite term with Luke in his narrative, Σατανᾶς being almost always reserved for our Lord's words. This passage in question is the only occasion in St. Luke when our Lord uses this expression.

Matthew also changes the Σατανᾶς of Mark, substituting πονηρός, the only occasion in the Synoptic Gospels on which we can feel absolutely certain that this term must refer to some superhuman person. At the same time he makes the action of his Evil One all the more heinous by substituting the verb ἄρπάζει for the much milder αἴρει of Mark. No longer now is the Satan responsible - indirectly - for the taking away of the word: it is the Evil One who snatches it away like some ravaging foe.

Now it is our task to examine the two remaining references to Satan in Mark. Our Lord has been healing many who were ill; over those thought to be possessed by demons he has been exerting his curative powers. "And unclean spirits when they saw him, fell down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the

Son of God." (III.11.). He then ordains the twelve, giving them 'power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils.' All this produced strange reactions in those around. His relatives tried to restrain him, thinking that he was mad. But the scribes took up a different attitude, saying, "He hath Beelzebub, and by the prince of the devils casteth he out devils." Our Lord confutes their arguments by parabolical questions. "And he called them unto him and said unto them in parables, How can Satan cast out Satan? And if a kingdom be divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand. And if a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand. And if Satan rise up against himself, and be divided, he cannot stand, but hath an end." (III. 23-26.).

At the beginning of our examination we must draw attention to the weakness of our English Versions in translating the Greek word δαίμων by 'devil,' when the correct rendering should be, as is suggested in the Margin of the Revised Version, 'demon.' Beelzebub is the 'prince of the demons,' and this must always be remembered when attempts are made to equate Satan and Beelzebub. Satan, we must agree, had already, in the Apocalyptic literature, been recognised

as the chief or prince of the devils; but it is not necessary to suggest that the 'prince of the demons' must be Satan. It is true that in the Book of Jubilees (X.8.) Mastema is spoken of as being 'the chief of the spirits;' but there are other indications in the literature of contemporary Judaism which suggest that this office might be the peculiar prerogative of one of Satan's subordinates. Milton, it is worth noting, made no attempt to identify the two in his 'Paradise Lost.'

So Satan spake, and him Beelzebub
Thus answered.

He scarce had ceas'd when the superiour Fiend
Was moving toward the shore.

Little is known about the word Beelzebub. It is met with in no Jewish literature apart from the Old Testament, and here it occurs in one passage only. "And Ahaziah fell down through a lattice in his upper chamber that was in Samaria, and was sick: and he sent messengers, and said to them, Go, enquire of Baal-Zebub the god of Ekron whether I shall recover of this disease. But the angel of the Lord said to Elijah the Tishbite, Arise, go up to meet the messengers of the king of Samaria, and say unto them, Is it because there is not a God in Israel that ye go to enquire of Baal-Zebub the god of Ekron?" (II.Kings, I. 3,4.).

Many theories have been held as to the meaning of the word Beelzebub, or, as it appears in most of the best New Testament MSS., Beelzebul. Perhaps the best interpretation is that it means 'Lord of Flies,' a theory supported by the LXX rendering --- βασιλ μύαν . Additional support for this interpretation is furnished by Flavius Josephus in his Antiquities:—καὶ νοσήσαντα πέμψαι πρὸς τὸν Ἀκκαρῶν θεὸν μύαν (Book IX. 2.). Nor is it difficult to see how such a name came into being, for plagues were often regarded as being due to the influence of flies. For this idea we may consult Exodus XXII. 28:- "And I will send hornets before thee, which shall drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite, from before thee." More or less similar is a passage in Ecclesiastes:- "Flies of death cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savour." (X.1.). The Jerusalem Targum to this passage of Ecclesiastes indicates that the Jews regarded flies as being not only impure, but also somewhat demonic. With reference to this same passage there is the Rabbinic comment, "The evil inclination (צדק צדק) lies like a fly at the doors of the human heart." It is worth comparing with

this the saying:- "A fly, being an impure thing, was never seen in the slaughter-house of the Temple."

(Aboth, V.8.).

Lightfoot suggested that the word meant 'Lord of Dung,' associating שֶׁדַּי with שֶׁדַּי , a word found in Late Hebrew. It is presumed that some word meaning 'Lord of Flies' has been changed into 'Lord of Dung' as a motion indicating the detestation in which heathendom was held. It should here be mentioned that the word Beelzebul is not Hebrew, but Aramaic. The root ܒܠܕܝܠ was a common term for dung in Syriac. (vide Payne Smith, 'Thesaurus.').

Another suggestion is that the word really means 'Lord of the High House,' derived from שֶׁדַּי (see Oxford Hebrew Dictionary). This means that the term as we now find it in the best MSS is in its original form. The form found in the Old Testament - Baalzebub - is 'a modification in the direction of cacophony for religious reasons (cf. Gog, Magog) which did not hold its ground.' (Encyc. Bib. art. 'Beelzebub.'). To the Jews of the New Testament period, according to this theory, the word would mean 'Lord of the Nether World.' In support of this it is advanced that in Psalm XLIX. 15, Sheol is ironically

described as the S. 17 of the wicked rich, and that here we have a similar use as applied to the abode of the demons.

According to the passage from II. Kings which we have quoted above, Beelzebub seems to be the rival of Jehovah, and it is not difficult to see how later ages came to regard this god as being evil. We have frequently observed how the passing of the centuries has led men to clothe with evil that which had once been not so evil; to make the god of the other race into one of their own devils. The period between the writing of this portion of II. Kings and the composition of the Gospels had witnessed the fabrication of countless demons; and it was not out of keeping with the spirit of the age that this Beelzebul should be given the rank of prince of the demons. Not unlike this was the attitude towards Azazel as reflected in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch. The name Beelzebul is nowhere mentioned in later Jewish literature, and from this it has been very naturally conjectured that it lost its popularity soon after the New Testament period.

When, according to Mark, the scribes suggested that our Lord was casting out demons by the power of the prince of the demons, he employed the same figurative

language in refuting their accusation. He used the word Satan, but he used it in a very remarkable way. πῶς δύναται Σατανᾶς Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν; Here, it will be observed, the word Satan in both instances lacks the definite article, a usage most rare in the New Testament, unless the Vocative Case is being employed. And now we shall suggest that the correct translation is:- "How can a Satan cast out a Satan?" As we have already noted, the Satans appeared frequently in the Parables of the Ethiopic Enoch; and the renderings of the English Versions make this question lose all its point. A demon could be associated with a Satan; the prince of the demons was still himself a demon. May not our Lord's question really mean, 'Can a demon cast out a demon?' Can we anywhere find another example of where an ordinary demon is spoken of as Satan (i.e. the Satan and not a Satan)? The position becomes more obvious when attention is paid to the other similies which follow: if strife occurs between the individuals who make up a kingdom, then that kingdom ceases to be a unity, and it comes to an end. A similar state of affairs will prevail, although on a smaller scale, if the members of a household become at variance with one another.

That Matthew and Luke felt that there was something

peculiar about these words is rendered apparent by the way in which they treated them. Luke omits them entirely: while Matthew takes it upon himself to add those definite articles which are normally to be found in occurrences of the word Satan, making the passage now read καὶ εἰ ὁ Σατανᾶς τοὺς Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει. This is a most unhappy compromise, as becomes clear when the words are submitted to a minute logical examination. In the first place, the Satan is now made identical with Beelzebub. Had such an identification been based on a current conception, we surely should not have been faced with so arresting a phenomenon as the fact that the word is not mentioned in any contemporary or later Jewish literature. In the second place, there is that even more difficult, and much less feasible, implication that the Satan is identified with the demon. This most certainly is not to be found elsewhere in any literature; although some English readers have been led to adopt this unfortunate conception through the Authorised Version's translation of the Greek word for demon (δαίμων) by 'devil.'

According to Mark, when our Lord had completed his similies of the kingdom and the household being at variance, he again made an allusion to Satan. On this oc-

casion the definite article is to be found in the text, and we need feel no hesitation in seeing here a reference to the Satan. "And if Satan rise up against himself, and be divided, he cannot stand, but hath an end." (verse 26.). Our Lord is again employing that figurative language which was so dear to the Jews of the period, although he does not make any implication of his own acceptance of its literal content. Contemporary Judaism, as we have already seen, had by this time acquired a highly-developed doctrine of Satan; and on one point there was universal agreement, viz:- the Satan, the chief of the Satans, was himself a unity. Now the extreme brilliance of our Lord's dialectic becomes manifest. If he, by means of evil, overcomes one of the expressions of evil, then is the kingdom of evil divided, and its monarchy can no longer be a unity. Two courses were left open to the scribes: they could either deny the existence - at least in the future - of their monarch of evil; or else they must confess that Jesus was casting out the demons by means of some higher and divine power. The dilemma with which they were faced was such that they could not answer in either way without lessening the scope of their Satan, that figment of their imagination which had received almost all its characteristics

from sources other than their Canonical Scriptures. And, as is well known, it was these extraneous conceptions which our Lord attacked so vehemently.

Matthew omits this passage, presumably on the grounds that he had already, in his mind, expressed this thought in his earlier words καὶ εἰ ὁ Σατανᾶς τὸν Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει. Luke, however, who had omitted the former passage, does not hesitate to insert the latter, his version being as follows: - εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν διαμαρτίσθῃ, κ.τ.λ. (XI.18.). The interpretation of this passage will follow the lines which we laid down when examining the words on which it is based.

Beelzebul once more crosses our vision before he finally vanishes. Common to Matthew and Luke, but not found in Mark, is an additional refutation by our Lord of the charge brought against him. "And if I by Beelzebul drive out demons, by whom do your children drive them out? Therefore they shall be your judges. But if I drive out the demons by the spirit of God, then the kingdom of God hath already come upon you." (Matthew, XII.27,28: cf. Luke, XI.18.). Our Lord seems here to accept as a fact that the Jewish exorcists were able to cast out demons. Why then, if they were held to be able to do this without any

Satanic aid, should such unholy assistance be postulated in his own case?

Now an interesting problem arises as to why the scribes should ever have suggested that Jesus was casting out the demons by means of the power of Beelzebul. Exorcism was no uncommon matter at this time; in fact, their own sons did it without arousing any suspicion. It would seem, therefore, as though it were some phenomena other than the actual exorcism which had rendered our Lord suspect. Can we find any indications of the existence of such phenomena? Was there anything extraordinary in the behaviour of either our Lord or the demons? On making a careful study of the incident, and of the events which immediately preceded it, we meet with one striking allusion. "And unclean spirits, when they saw him, fell down before him and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God." (Mark, III. 11.). It may well be that in these words there are given the reasons underlying the allegations of the scribes: it was not the act of exorcism that made them feel suspicious; rather was it the immediate result of this exorcism. Their sons may have cast out demons, but it is hardly likely that these demons would have asserted that their exorcists were divine.

Summarising the results of our examination of the Marcan evidence, we may say that of the five occurrences of the word Satan, three would seem to have no more baneful connotation than that of the word as found in Job.. Regarding the two remaining references, it should be noted that, while they are both Dominical utterances, our Lord is rebutting an argument of his opponents, and he is employing their figures of speech. He seems to make use of this word Satan in senses which were popular in contemporary Judaism. There are more or less valid reasons for us to think that he made reference to the Satans, those subordinates of Satan mentioned in the Ethiopic Enoch and elsewhere. His second mention of Satan in this context may indicate something akin to the Testing Angel of Job, or he may have been using the word in its more sinister contemporary sense, for we know that at this moment he was confuting his opponents in their own language. There is nothing in Mark to show that our Lord accepted the current conceptions of Satan. And the avoidance of the word διαβολος is significant.

ST. MATTHEW.

Now we must investigate the references to the Evil One in St. Matthew's Gospel. No longer, as in Mark, do

we find that he is spoken of only as Σατανᾶς; διάβολος is also employed, as is ὁ πονηρός. An analysis shows that the totals are as follows. Σατανᾶς is found three times; διάβολος six times; ὁ πονηρός at least once. Of these Σατανᾶς occurs in Dominical utterances only; on one occasion it has the definite article, the other two instances of its use show the word to be in the Vocative Case. Each of these three examples will now be submitted to a detailed examination.

(1). λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ὑπάγε, Σατανᾶ (IV. 10.).

This is the only reference to Satan which is peculiar to Matthew. Occurring in the Temptation-story, it forms our Lord's dismissal of Satan. What is really remarkable about this passage is that, throughout his narrative of the Temptations, Matthew always uses ὁ διάβολος (4 times), except in these words spoken by Jesus himself. It seems safe to conclude that the word has the same force which it has in the Old Testament. That, for our Lord, the Satan in this passage is little worse than the Satan who tested Job is to be seen by comparing this reproof of the Devil with the almost identical reproof of Peter at Caesarea Philippi.

(2). καὶ εἰ ὁ Σατανᾶς τὸν Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει, κ.τ.λ. (XII. 26.).

This has been taken from Mark, the important change

being that the definite article has been added to *Σαρανᾶς* in both of its occurrences. The full significance of this has been discussed in detail in our treatment of the original passage in Mark. As then, so now, it is not easy to see what is the real signification of the word; in fact, it is much harder here than in the Marcan version, due to Matthew's unfortunate addition of the definite articles. Of one fact we can feel certain: there is no indication here that our Lord accepted the views on the Devil held by contemporary Judaism.

(3). Ὁπάρει ὁπίσω μου, Σαρανᾶ (XVI.23.). This also has been taken from Mark, the words being identical with the Greek of Mark VIII. 33. Our discussion of the Marcan passage, and our findings, will hold good equally well for this present example. One conclusion only shall we venture to repeat. Here we have no reference to some personification of supreme evil. It is merely a reproof administered to St. Peter: one to whom it was also said, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail ~~pre~~ against it." (Matthew, XVI.18.). At the worst, the word cannot here possess a connotation more sinister than that of Job.

Of the six instances of the use of the word διαβολας in Matthew, we may note that four of these occur in a single section, viz: the Temptation-story. Here they are confined to the narrative, and do not appear among the utterances of our Lord. Much has been written on the subject of the Temptations, and it would be outside the scope of this essay to enter into a discussion of the signification of this incident. All that we need say is that many factors have been at work in its production. Of these Dr. Montefiore has given the following able summary:-

"First of all, there was the view that some great heroes of olden times, e.g. Abraham and Job, had been tempted and had conquered. Jesus, who was greater than Abraham, must also have been a great conqueror. Secondly, there was the belief that one of the functions of the Messiah was to conquer Satan, the chief devil, and to overcome the demons. Thirdly, there were parallels in other religions, and it is not impossible that the temptation stories of Buddha may have influenced the Gospel narratives. Fourthly, the story puts at the beginning of the life of Jesus, in one concentrated and highly imaginative form, certain real temptations with which he possibly had to grapple in the course of his actual life." (The Synoptic Gospels, 466).

Most scholars would recognise that the Temptations are largely symbolic, and that the figure of the Devil is merely a part of this symbolism. It represents the spirit of temptation, although the use of the term διάβολος, substituted for the Σατανᾶς of Mark, may be supposed to have ascribed to this spirit evil attributes. In the Old Testament, when we read of the testing of Job, we must ever remember that we are dealing with a work of the imagination rather than with a historical record. Even the Satan, the Testing Angel, is only a symbol of the spirit of temptation or testing. Here also in the Gospels, the Devil must be recognised as being symbolic.

Two other examples remain of the use of the word διάβολος in Matthew, both of these occurring in our Lord's words. Neither of these passages is to be found in the other two Gospels, and both, significantly enough, are of a highly apocalyptic nature.

The first is the interpretation of the parable of the wheat and the tares. "He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom, but the tares are the children of the wicked one: the enemy that sowed them is the devil, the harvest is the end of the world,

and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of the world." (XIII. 37-40.). The primary consideration to be faced is that here the term δίαβολος cannot have merely that connotation which it possesses in the LXX on several occasions, viz: an earthly enemy. The entire section is an interpretation of the figurative language of the wheat and the tares: and it would be no interpretation at all to regard this verse as meaning 'the earthly enemy (ἐχθρός) who sowed them is the earthly enemy (ὁ διάβολος)'. Yet another factor which would militate against such a rendering is the presence of the definite article with διάβολος. Taking into account also the trend of the passage as a whole, and noting its violent eschatological nature, we cannot avoid the conclusion that the Devil mentioned here is something closely akin to that superhuman figure of evil which permeates the literature of the Jewish apocalyptic movement. It is not for us to decide whether this is a genuine Dominical saying, or whether it is an interpretation of the parable which obtained currency amongst some apocalyptic party in the Church; all we can do is to remark on the significant fact that the passage is peculiar to Matthew, universally confessed to be the most Jewish of the Gospels.

How are we to take the words τὰ δὲ ζῳάνια εἰσὶν οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ? As we shall see later, Matthew does use the expression ὁ πονηρός as an appellative for the Devil; but can we feel certain that this is the force of the word in the present context? As it stands it may be either masculine or neuter; it may be either an adjective or a noun: if masculine, it may refer either to a natural or a supernatural person. At first sight it seems so easy to follow our English Versions, rendering the passage:- "And the tares are the sons of the evil one." (A.V. wicked). But it should be noted that our translators felt a certain amount of hesitancy about this rendering, for both Versions print the word 'one' in italics. Jerome also would appear to have experienced some doubt, as is shown by his rendering: 'Filii sunt nequam.' This becomes more obvious when we compare with it his rendering of ὁ πονηρός in the version given by Matthew of the interpretation of the Sower --- an unmistakable use of ὁ πονηρός for the Devil, for Mark has here Σατανᾶς, and Luke διάβολος. But here the Vulgate reads 'venit malus.' In all those other passages in Matthew where different interpreters at different periods have thought that ὁ πονηρός (and in cases other than the Nominative) indicates the Evil One,

we find that Jerome regularly employs 'malus.' But in this singular instance he employs 'filii sunt nequam,' nequam being an indeclinable adjective which may refer to the material, meaning worthless or vile: it may also refer to character, meaning bad or dissolute. It should be noted that the superlative of the word is used by Jerome as a translation for *πονηρός* in Ephesians VI. 16, a passage which is generally thought to refer to the Evil One.

An examination of the context seems to indicate that a much better parallelism would be obtained if the word were to be regarded, not as being masculine, but neuter. The translation would then run as follows:- "The good seed are the children of the kingdom, but the tares are the children of evil." By this means we have attained a balance between 'the kingdom' and 'evil' which is much more in keeping with the custom of Matthew in the arrangement of his sentences.

Now we must turn to the remaining instance of the word *διάβολος* in Matthew. Here we meet with a passage which is apocalyptic in the extreme, and although the words are put into the mouth of our Lord, they are of such a nature that they would seem rather to have emanated from the pens of the pseudepigraphical writers.

The passage itself constitutes a description of the Last Judgment: the sheep have been set on the right hand, and the goats on the left. "Then shall he say also to them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." (XXV. 41.). There can be no question as to the connotation of δ.ᾱβολος in this passage. Here we have no earthly enemy, no LXX rendering of the Testing Angel of Job: here is the Devil, personal and altogether evil, of the apocalyptic writings. The entire conception would have harmonised perfectly, had it formed part of the Book of Enoch: but in a Gospel it is little short of incongruous. Small wonder is it that Mark, Luke, and John, contain nothing in the nature of a parallel: more than significant is the manner in which the Reference Bibles direct the reader to II. Peter and Jude. Even the Devil's angels of the Apocalypses are mentioned. Here is the apocalyptic eternal fire ----- compare Ethiopic Enoch X. 13, "In those days they (the evil angels) shall be led off to the abyss of fire: and to the torment and the prison in which they shall be confined for ever." Another parallel may be seen in the Slavonic Book of Enoch, where mention is made of the 'very terrible place.' Here Enoch was

shown the tortures, the 'cruel darkness and unilluminated gloom, and there is no light there, but murky fire constantly flameth aloft, and there is a fiery river coming forth, and that whole place is everywhere fire, and everywhere there is frost and ice, thirst and shivering, while the bonds are very cruel, and the angels fearful and merciless, bearing angry weapons, merciless torture, and I said: 'Woe, woe, how very terrible is this place,' and those men said unto me: 'This place, O Enoch, is prepared for those who dishonour God ----- who being able to satisfy the empty, made the hungering to die: being able to clothe, stripped the naked: and who knew not their creator.'"(X. 1-6.).

These quotations serve to show that the idea of a place of punishment, with eternal fires, prepared for the devil and his angels, was quite common in apocalyptic thought. Thus we may feel little hesitation about accepting the rendering of our Versions, "prepared for the devil and his angels." At the same time, however, we must be ready to recognise the possibility of another translation:- "which is prepared by the devil and his angels." This demands that we regard τῷ διαβόλῳ as being the Dative of the Agent, a construction which is found, howbeit somewhat rarely, in the Greek of the New

Testament (vide Matthew VI.1., Luke, XXIII.15., Acts, I. 3.). To this conception also we can find parallels in the apocalyptic literature; in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch the punishment of the wicked was one of the duties of the Satans, and when fulfilling this function they were known as the 'angels of punishment.' (see Ethiopic Enoch, LIII.3, LVI.1, LXII.11, LXIII.1.).

There are several instances of the word *πονηρὸς* in Matthew having been interpreted of the Devil. About one example we can feel no doubt, for here Matthew reads Evil One; Mark, the Satan; Luke, the Devil. It is hardly likely that our Lord would have interpreted this parable of the sower on three different occasions, employing three different words. At some later period there must have been a deliberate change made in the words: and of these three versions, one may be right, but two must be wrong. It is but natural that we should regard the word employed by Mark --- the Satan --- as being most likely to be the original. This was the favourite expression of our Lord for the Devil, and it is not difficult to appreciate the reasons which led the other two evangelists to substitute words which appealed to them.

In the rendering of the Lord's Prayer in the Revised Version we find "But deliver us from the evil one," al-

though the Margin and the Authorised Version suggest that the word is neuter, and that 'from evil' should be read. Modern scholars incline towards this latter interpretation, equating 'evil' with that inner subjective evil. Compare Montefiore's words:- "Rabbinic analogies would make it probable that 'from evil' is an adequate translation, and that 'evil' is not so much calamity as the inward evil, the Yetzer hara' of the Rabbis, the evil inclination which is sometimes also half-personified and regarded as a power of evil as much outside man as within him." (The Synoptic Gospels, page 535.).

In a similar manner the rendering of the Authorised Version is to be preferred in the teaching on oaths:- "But let your communications be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." (V.37.). The Revised Version reads 'of the evil one,' although 'of evil' is suggested in the Margin. Here again most scholars are agreed that the word is best to be regarded as a neuter; and Allen says (I.C.C. in loc.) it is 'the evil and sinful element in life regarded from the abstract point of view.'

The problem arises a second time in the same section:- "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, Resist not the wicked; but whoever smiteth thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also." (V.39.). The Revised Version, however, takes $\tau\omega$ $\pi\omicron\upsilon\eta\rho\omega$ as being

masculine - 'resist not him that is evil.' Few have been led to interpret this of the Devil, even though the masculine is preferred; the words which follow make such a rendering hardly tenable. Moreover, there would be a violent disharmony between this and the sentiment expressed in the Epistle of James (cf. also the Testament of Naphtali, VIII.4.) "Resist the devil, and he will flee away from you." (IV.7.).

The remaining suspect passage we have already examined in our study of the interpretation of the parable of the wheat and the tares, advancing our reasons for regarding this as being neuter, and that it does not refer to the Evil One.

In the incident of the Temptation; in our English Versions, we find that the Devil is once referred to as 'the tempter.' This possesses no doctrinal significance of any note, the Greek use of the definite article with the participle merely indicating the function which was being fulfilled by the Devil at the moment, viz: that of tempting. The expression ὁ πειράζων may be attaining some personal force in II. Thessalonians:- "Lest by some means the tempter have tempted you, and our labour be in vain." (III.5.).

In a summary of the contribution made by Matthew we may note that he expands the Temptation-story,

employing the word διάβολος : that Jesus always seems to use ὁ Σατανᾶς , except in two passages (διάβολος) which are so apocalyptic that they must be viewed with suspicion, and in a third passage where ὁ πονηρός has been substituted for the Satan of Mark. That our Lord employs the word Satan in its Old Testament sense, except in the Beelzebul incident borrowed from Mark. That of the suggested personal meanings of πονηρός , only one passage admits of no other interpretation.

ST. LUKE.

Luke contains ten references to the Devil or to Satan. In five of these the word employed is διάβολος , in the rest Σατανᾶς is found. Little need be said about the former group, for four of the instances occur in the narrative of the Temptations. The fifth instance would seem at first sight to be somewhat unique; for here, apparently, there is an example of our Lord using the word διάβολος. On a closer examination, however, we find that this passage, the interpretation of the parable of the sower, is based on the Marcan version; and that in what is undoubtedly the original, the word used by our Lord was Σατανᾶς . As we have already seen, Matthew also employed the Marcan version, substituting the word πονηρός --- a substitution

which would seem to indicate that, for him, Σατανᾶς had not a sufficiently evil connotation. Nor, apparently, was Luke too enamoured of the Marcan expression. Hence his substitution of a word which was (1) sanctioned by its use in the LXX, and (2) possessed of a more evil content, due to its Classical antecedents, than Σατανᾶς. Accepting the theory of the priority of Mark, we can attach no weight whatsoever to our Lord's seeming use of the word διαβόλος. But what is significant is that both Matthew and Luke should have been at such pains, at this point, to change the source which they were employing; and what is more interesting is to note that they adopted different words, thereby seeming to manifest that they were working independently.

Now we must investigate in detail the references to Satan (Σατανᾶς) in this Gospel. Four of the five occur in our Lord's words: the fifth is part of the Lucan narrative, the only occasion in the Synoptic Gospels when a reference to Σατανᾶς does not occur in a Dominical saying, with the single exception of Mark, I.13:- "And he was in the wilderness forty days, tempted of Satan."

This important passage which we are to investigate furnishes yet another example of a tendency which we have frequently seen at work in the earlier sections of

this study, viz:- the reading-in of a reference to Satan in connection with unhappy incidents, these incidents having previously been traced to some other cause. In this instance it is with the betrayal of Jesus that we are concerned. According to Mark, who is followed in this by Matthew, the cause of the betrayal is Judas, who is actuated by a desire for money. But in Luke the matter is traced back a little further, and the figure of Satan is introduced. "Then entereth Satan into Judas surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve. And he went his way, and communed with the chief priests and captains, how he might betray him unto them. And they were glad, and covenanted to give him money." (XXII. 3.). It is not necessary to suggest that here we have a reference to that altogether evil personality of the apocalyptic literature. More likely is it that this is little more than a current expression employed to indicate that Judas was sorely tempted.

A similar introduction of the figure of the Evil One is to be observed in the Fourth Gospel, where on two occasions it is stated that he had entered into Judas. On the first occasion the word διαβολος (John, XIII. 2.) is used: on the second (John, XIII. 27.), it is Σατανᾶς. The latter example is not lacking in significance, being

in the Johannine literature, apart from the Book of Revelation, on which the word *Σατανᾶς* is to be seen. Such, indeed, is the significance of this fact that many scholars have been led to conclude that the second of these passages has been taken from Luke.

Turning now to the Dominical references to Satan in Luke we may note that, of the four, two seem to be based upon Mark. In this latter Gospel, as it will be remembered, our Lord made two references to Satan during the Beelzebul incident, the former of which presented unusual characteristics. Matthew took over the former, introducing modifications in the shape of the addition of the definite article: Luke, on the other hand, took over the second only --- the more conventional reference. "If Satan also be divided against himself, how shall his kingdom stand? because ye say that I cast out devils through Beelzebul?" (XI.18.). This passage presents no undue difficulties; our Lord adopts their own phraseology, suggesting that they should draw the logical conclusion that both the demons and their chief belong to the vast kingdom of the Satan: if a super-demon were to cast out demons, then would there ensue disruption in the Satanic kingdom. Again we must lay stress on the fact that our Lord nowhere

indicates his own acceptance of this belief, common though it was in contemporary apocalyptic thought: he merely adopts popular figures of speech in his very convincing arguments.

We have already investigated the reproof of Peter at Caesarea Philippi, where our Lord addressed him as Satan, manifestly giving this word the connotation which it possesses in Job. This incident is recorded in Mark, who is followed by Matthew, word for word in the original Greek. (Jerome, strangely enough, introduces a little variety, reading 'Vade retro me, Satana' in Mark, but 'Vade post me, Satana' in Matthew.) Luke, however, omits both Peter's words and our Lord's rebuke, although he does give a close parallel in the discourse which followed the Institution of the Eucharist. "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren. And he said unto him, Lord, I am ready to go with thee both into prison and to death."(XXII. 31-33.).

Here, we must confess, Peter is no longer identified - an identification based on an immediate function - with the Satan. Rather is he regarded as being the object

of the Satan's attention. He was to be sifted as wheat: in other words, he was to experience a period of testing. Now the idea of testing is altogether transitive: it postulates the existence, not only of that which is tested, but also of one who tests. And in Jewish thought it had once always been God who did this testing; but with the passing of the years, with the development of the human understanding, God had tended to become more remote and more transcendent. Some angelic agent had to be introduced, whose function it was to test men on behalf of God. This angelic agent was called the Satan; and he it is who must test Peter. In this way we can safely conclude that the word is used by our Lord in its ordinary Old Testament sense.

Peculiar to Luke is the healing of the 'woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, and was bowed together, and could in no wise lift up herself.' Our Lord healed her; but it was the Sabbath day, and he therefore incurred the rebuke of the ruler of the Synagogue. To this he replies by asserting that the needs of the moment are more important than the observation of the day itself:- "Thou hypocrite, doth not each one of you on the sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And

ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the sabbath day?" (XIII. 15, 16.). This passage is well worthy of investigation, manifesting, as it does, that popular conception of contemporary thought which associated bodily suffering with the activities of Satan. We see the beginnings of this conception in the Book of Job, where affliction of the body was one of the trials which the righteous man had to undergo. Later, when apocalyptic was in the fullness of its gaudy bloom, the conception reached its height. Bodily diseases were attributed to the Satans in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch: they were regarded as a concomitant of the Fall in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch.

Elsewhere in the New Testament this conception is to be observed. St. Paul speaks of his 'thorn in the flesh' as an ἄγγελος Σατάν (II. Corinthians, XII. 7.). And perhaps this is what he means when he says:- "To deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, in order that the spirit may be saved." (I. Corinthians, V. 5.). There may also be a reference to this underlying Acts, X. 38:- "And healing all that were oppressed of the devil."

Here again, in this Lucan passage, we must recognise

that our Lord is merely employing the phraseology of the period, such phraseology as would most easily be understood by his audience. And even if it be insisted that he is postulating a belief in the existence of Satan, can we be certain that he is carrying the idea to any stage further than that which it reached in the Book of Job?

The last of the Lucan passages to be studied is the saying of our Lord, also peculiar to Luke, "I beheld Satan as lightning falling from heaven." (X.18.). We are somewhat handicapped when we come to study this verse, largely due to our deeply-engrained knowledge of the Authorised Version. Few of us can read these words without placing them in close association with a passage from Isaiah:- "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cast down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God ---- I will be like the Most High." (XIV. 12-14.). But an association such as this is not justifiable, for the words of Isaiah do not refer to Satan, but to the king of Babylon. Lucifer, later a favourite name for Satan, goes no further back than the Latin Versions, the

original Hebrew meaning nothing worse than 'morning-star.'

This Lucan passage must be studied in its context. Our Lord had sent the Seventy out on their mission; and now they had returned, reporting on their successes. "Lord, even the demons are subject unto us through thy name. And he said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning falling from heaven. Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall by any means hurt you." (X.17-19.). As we have already seen, when investigating the Beelzebul episode, our Lord was willing to employ current phraseology regarding demons. They were ever in contemporary thought associated with Satan; and their overthrow must necessarily mean some sort of a defeat of Satan.

Plummer (I.C.C.) interprets this passage in a very literal manner:- "In the defeat of the demons He saw the downfall of their chief. This passage is again conclusive evidence as to Christ's teaching respecting the existence of a personal power of evil. ----- In all these cases it would have been quite natural to speak of impersonal evil." (page 278.). The validity of the argument is open to question; for our Lord taught at a

time when the personification of evil was most popular, and it is much to be doubted whether his hearers would have understood him so well had he used impersonal language.

The idea of a fall of Satan was not uncommon in the apocalyptic writings, a good example being furnished by the Slavonic Book of Enoch. "And I threw him (one from out the order of angels) out from the height with his angels, and he was flying in the air continuously above the bottomless." (XXIX.5.). It is, then, entirely feasible that our Lord was speaking figuratively in this way of the defeat of Satan.

We shall, however, have the temerity to suggest that this incident admits of a completely different interpretation. This we shall base on the hypothesis that our Lord is using the term Satan, as was his wont, in the sense which it possesses in Job: that we have here a reference to some sort of temptation. The Seventy seem to be a little too exultant about their successes; they are in grave danger of falling into spiritual pride. Hence our Lord adds the warning words:- "Notwithstanding in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rather rejoice, because your names are written in heaven." (X.20.)

From our study of Job we have seen that heaven was, as it were, the home base from which Satan worked: and from here he descended to earth to tempt mortals. Due to their elation about their new powers, the Seventy are in a precarious state, and temptation immediately assails them. Satan comes down to earth with the speed of a flash of lightning. Some support may be found for this suggestion by noting that the verb employed in the original Greek is $\pi\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\omega$: and that we do not meet with the passive voice of some such verb as $\epsilon\kappa\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$. Satan is the subject of this precipitate dive to earth.

The Early Church did not hesitate to associate these words with the passage of Isaiah which we have already quoted. Thus Origen (De Princip: Book 1. 5.) first quotes in full the Isaiah passage, following this by the Lucan statement, and drawing the conclusion that the Saviour compares Satan to the lightning because once he was light. "And notwithstanding he compares him to lightning, and says that he fell from heaven, that he might show by this that he had been at one time in heaven, and had had a place among the saints, and had enjoyed a share in that light in which all the saints participate, by which they are made angels of

light, and by which the apostles are termed by the Lord the light of the world. In this manner, then, did that being once exist as light before he went astray, and fell to this place, and had his glory turned into dust, which is peculiarly the mark of the wicked, as the prophet also says; whence, too, he was called the prince of this world, i.e. of an earthly habitation."

In summing-up the evidence provided by Luke we may note that the conception of Satan underlying seven of his examples seems to approximate most closely to that of Job. About the remaining three there exists some doubt, but there is not one which cannot be associated with the Job conception. There are no passages of a highly apocalyptic character, such as the two which were found in Matthew. There is nothing to demand that our Lord was using other than that symbolic or metaphorical language which his audience would understand so well.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

In view of the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Ephesians having been questioned in recent years, we

propose to deal with this writing in a separate section. For a similar reason we shall exclude the so-called Pastoral Epistles from this chapter. Thus the Epistles which we are to examine are Romans, I. and II. Corinthians, I. and II. Thessalonians, Galatians, Philippians, and Colossians.

Paul never uses the word διάβολος : on the other hand, he does use Σατανᾶς - or Σατάν - no less than eight times. There are no occurrences of this term in Galatians, Philippians or Colossians. As we have already noted, the word Σατανᾶς may, in the New Testament, be employed in more than one sense; and it is sometimes far from easy to determine exactly how it was being used by Paul. He was, we know, steeped in the Old Testament: but he was also a Pharisee, deeply imbued with the spirit of that sect. Now our problem is this: Did he derive his doctrine of Satan directly from the Old Testament, or did he draw on that vast corpus of teaching which ~~was~~ was embodied in the literature of apocalyptic and current Judaism?

About some of the examples no hesitation need be felt: they reflect little more than the ideas of Job. Satan, as in the Synoptic Gospels, is one whose task it is to tempt or test; and sometimes he fulfils this function

by means of acting as an opposer. Amongst the problems which had arisen in the Corinthian Church was that of marital relations, the following ruling being given by the Apostle:- "Do not withhold sexual intercourse from one another, unless you agree to do so for a time in order to devote yourselves to prayer. Then come together again. You must not let Satan tempt you through incontinence." (I. Corinthians, VII. 5. following Moffatt's rendering.). Here the underlying conception is undoubtedly as early as that of Job:

Σαραβάς may best be regarded as the spirit of temptation or testing. It is true that Job was not tempted in this particular way; at the same time it is not difficult to conjecture how temptation should have come to be regarded as taking this form. With reference to this it should be stated that in the Fragments of a Zadokite Work, the Fall of the Watchers was regarded as being due to incontinence and fornication. "To walk uprightly in all his ways, and not to go about in the thoughts of an evil imagination and with eyes full of fornication. For many were led astray by them, and mighty men of valour from of old stumbled by them, and until this day. Because they walked in the stubbornness of their heart the Watchers of heaven fell."

(III. 2-4.). A similar idea is to be seen expressed in the Testament of Reuben:- "Flee, therefore, fornication ----- because every woman who useth these wiles hath been reserved for eternal punishment. For thus they allured the Watchers who were before the flood." (V.5.).

The simple Old Testament conception of Satan as an opposer is very happily revealed in I. Thessalonians. "Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I Paul, once and again; but Satan hindered us." (II.18.). At first sight it would be tempting to suggest that this opposition took the form of Paul's illness, for this was one of the ways in which the Satan was instructed to test Job. On the other hand, this would hardly apply to Silvanus and Timothy (vide Everling 'Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie,' page 74.). Frame (I.C.C. page 121) passes the following verdict:- 'Hence it is safer to leave the reference indefinite as Paul does (Everling, Dibelius, Mill.), or at most to think of 'the exigencies of his mission at the time being' (Moff.)'. What we should observe is that this opposition is nowhere suggested as being altogether evil; and if we follow the majority of scholars, we shall have to regard it as being Divine in origin. For it

seems most likely that it was merely the fulfilling of his divine mission in some other locality which prevented Paul from visiting Thessalonica.

A further manifestation of the Job conception is to be found in I. Corinthians. A terrible instance of incest had been brought to the notice of Paul, and he urges that disciplinary measures should be brought into force. "Expel the perpetrator of such a crime! For my part, present with you in spirit, though absent in body, I have already, as in your presence, passed sentence on such an offender as this, by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ; I have met with you in spirit and by the power of our Lord Jesus I have consigned that individual to Satan for the destruction of his flesh that his spirit may be saved on the day of the Lord Jesus." (V. 2-5.). (Moffatt.).

There is, of course, the possibility that these words are a rhetorical exaggeration, and that nothing more is indicated than some simple form of excommunication. More likely is it that there is present some idea of physical suffering; to leave the man to those retributive forces which inflict punishment on the body, and thereby ultimately effect the salvation of the soul. This was no novel idea: in fact, it is as old as the Book of Job, where God says to the Satan:- "Behold, he

is in thine hand; ρόνον τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ διαφύλαξον (II.6.).

What is most important for our investigation is the sentiment underlying the words 'in order that his spirit may be saved.' Whatever the Satan may indicate in this passage, it cannot be something wholly evil; its function seems to be almost divine. For the Satan is to be the agent or the instrument of the man's spirit being saved.

This conception of Satan inflicting physical punishment is not unknown in the apocalyptic literature. In the Book of Jubilees (X) the unclean demons begin to blind and slay and inflict diseases upon the sons of Noah. In the Zadokite Fragments we find that to Belial had been allotted the task of punishing sinners:- "And this also shall be the judgment of all them who have entered into his covenant, who will not hold fast to these statutes: they shall be visited for destruction through the hand of Belial." (IX.12.). Again, in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch, the Satans are shown to have, as one of their functions, the punishment of transgressors, e.g. "For I saw all the angels of punishment abiding there and preparing all the instruments of Satan. And I asked the angel of peace who went with me: 'For whom are they preparing these instruments?' And he said unto me: 'They

prepare these for the kings and the mighty of the earth, that they may thereby be destroyed.'"(LIII. 3-5.). Diseases were among the many forms which this punishment of the Satans could take.

Any association of Satan with physical suffering must eventually lead to a discussion of the thorn in the flesh. In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul speaks of this affliction in the following terms:- "And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure. For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me. And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness." (XII. 7-9.).

At the very outset it must be noted that although Paul does speak of his affliction as being a 'messenger of Satan,' nevertheless he regards it as being under the control of God. It is to God that he appeals for release from this affliction: it is God who ordains that the affliction should remain. Objectionable in itself, this thorn performed a good office for Paul, inasmuch as, in his own words, it prevented him from becoming 'exalted above measure.'

In what sense, then, was it termed 'the messenger of Satan?' Only a minute examination of the Greek text can enable us to pronounce any verdict upon this. Most certainly the rendering of the Authorised Version, quoted above, does not represent the Greek --- ἄγγελος Σατάν ἵνα με κολαρίῃ --- for here are no definite articles. Again, what are we to say about this word Σατάν, a term which occurs in no other passage of the New Testament, although the weight of evidence from the MSS shows that here it is the correct reading? Some scholars have wished to translate these words by 'a hostile angel,' making an appeal to those few passages which we mentioned in our chapter on the LXX.

Our suggestion is that these words are more or less in apposition, and that the correct translation should run somewhat as follows: "An angel, a Satan, to buffet me." The absence of the definite article would seem to indicate, in strict accordance with New Testament usage, that we have no reference to the Satan. But there are signs that here we have something closely akin to the Satans of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch. There were, as we have seen, several of these Satans, and they had many different functions. Amongst these was the inflicting on mankind of both bodily and mental suffering:- "And

the fifth was named Kasdeja: this is he who showed all the children of men all the wicked smittings of spirits and demons, and the smittings of the embryo in the womb, that it may pass away, and the smittings of the soul, the bites of the serpent, and the smittings which befall through the noontide heat." (LXIX.12.). It would be outside our province to enter into any discussion as to the real nature of this thorn in the flesh, but it may be said that here even additional weight is lent to the theory that Paul's affliction was of a nervous or mental character.

An interesting reference to Satan is made in this same epistle. "For such are false ~~prophets~~ apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel, for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works." (II. Corinthians, XI. 13-15.). The words μετασχηματίζονται εἰς ἄγγελος φωτός admit of various interpretations. In the Book of Job we read that "The sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and the Satan came also among them." Now we know that 'sons of God' was accepted as a synonym for angels; we also know how colourfully the wickedness of Satan was

depicted in contemporary Jewish literature. In this way, then, the Apostle could well be combining, and yet contrasting, these two different attitudes towards Satan:- "For even Satan is allowed a far different representation --- as an angel of light." Another possible translation, adopted by Moffatt, is:- "Satan himself masquerades as an angel of light." This may look back to some current legends about Satan; that he, as Sammael, was the angel who wrestled with Jacob (vide article 'Sammael' in the Jewish Encyc.). There was also a legend that Satan transformed himself into an angel and sang hymns. "And instantly he hung himself from the wall of paradise, and when the angels ascended to worship God, then Satan appeared in the form of an angel and sang hymns like the angels." His object in doing this was the seduction of Eve. (vide the Apocalypse of Moses, XVII.1. in Charles's Apocrypha and Pseudeigrapha, Vol. II, page 146.) Paul suggests that his opponents are actuated by Satan; but we cannot feel certain that he means anything more than the spirit of opposition. Nor can we feel certain that he is lending his approval to the theories of Satan held by current Judaism.

In this same Second Epistle to the Corinthians

Paul makes mention of a member of the Church who has been the cause of some trouble. He, it seems, has been duly censured: and now Paul wishes to see him reinstated. "If you forgive the man, I forgive him too; anything I had to forgive him has been forgiven in the presence of God for your sakes, in case Satan should take advantage of our positions - for I know his manoeuvres!"(II.10,11, MOFFATT). The meaning is that they must be on their guard against that temptation to cruelty which assails all men, and never more insidiously than when assailing those in positions of power. For this is a temptation which appears in the guise of duty. The real tragedy about the Torquemada's of this world is not the harm which they do: it is the good which they so erroneously think that they do.

Satan, then, in this passage also, need mean little more than the spirit of temptation; something not so very much incomparable with that figure which appears in the Temptation-stories of the Synoptic Gospels. There is no need for us to ejaculate with Strachan (Moffatt New Testament Commentary, page 72) "Paul actually thinks of a personal evil power --- Satan, waiting his opportunity to rob Christ's people of the fruits of Christ's victory."

In the Epistle to the Romans, it has been thought, Paul seems to be using the word Satan in its contemporary idiomatic sense. "Everyone has heard of your loyalty to the Gospel; it makes me rejoice over you. Still, I want you to be experts in good and innocents in evil. The God of peace will soon crush Satan under your feet!"(XVI. 19,20. Moffatt's rendering.). Here there is some kind of a personification; but it is not easy to say whether it is evil which has been personified, or merely the spirit of temptation. A study of verses 17 and 18 shows that the latter interpretation is more likely to be correct. Those to whom he is writing Paul urges to be on their guard against the persons who 'with pious and plausible talk beguile the hearts of unsuspecting people.' Such men play the part of the Satan in yet another manner: for they oppose the faithful --- καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα παρὰ τὴν διδασχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐλάθετε ποιοῦντες ---.

Those who follow our Authorised and Revised Versions are always liable to see in the rendering 'shall bruise Satan under your feet' an allusion to the curse of the serpent in the Fall-story of Genesis III. Such an interpretation is hard to justify for the following reasons. Firstly, it is very much to be doubted whether Paul ever identified the serpent with Satan. Secondly,

the verb used in Romans (συντρίβω) is different from that in the LXX of Genesis (τρυφάω), although this latter objection is robbed of much its force on account of the verb in the original Hebrew being of somewhat uncertain meaning, and the reading of the LXX being corrupt (vide Spurrell, 'Notes on the Hebrew Text of Genesis' in loc.). Thirdly, the idea underlying the verb used in Romans is much stronger than that supposed to be indicated by the Hebrew; it is not so much as 'to bruise' as to 'crush out of existence.' One fact may be regarded as being established: the verb συντρίβω is not used in Genesis III. How the Romans and Genesis passages have come to resemble one another so closely in our Versions is undoubtedly due to the influence of the Vulgate, which employs the verb conterere in both instances.

The last example of Paul's use of the word Satan occurs in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. "Then shall the Lawless One be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus will destroy with the breath of his lips, and quell by his appearing and arrival - that One whose arrival is due to Satan's activity, with the full power, the miracles and portents, of falsehood, etc." (II.8,9. - following Moffatt's rendering.). The ap-

apocalyptic character of this passage has long been recognised, and it seems likely that Paul is here using the word Satan with its full apocalyptic force. Here we have a reference to that power of supreme evil which occupied so important a place in the religious philosophy of contemporary Judaism. We do not propose to discuss the context at this moment: such light as we can throw on the identity of the Lawless One must rather be included in our section on the Beliar Myth. In this same section we shall discuss the passage:- "And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part he that believeth with an infidel?" (II. Corinthians, VI.15.).

We may see in two other passages an indication that Paul did not hesitate to employ the language and the idiom of contemporary Judaism with reference to Satan. "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the eyes of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." (II. Corinthians, IV. 3,4.). This is one of the few occasions on which Paul's philosophy seems to approach anything resembling a dualism. Normally he seems to have been

strongly opposed to any such outlook, as may well be seen in the manner in which he combats that false teaching which was prevalent amongst the Colossians, a false teaching which was based on a supposed dualism of matter and spirit, good and evil. Perhaps here, then, we had better regard Paul as employing the language of contemporary Judaism, although he was not accepting literally the words which he used. Something closely akin to this expression 'the god of this world' may be seen in a favourite current title for Satan -- 'the prince of this age.' Again, there was a current Rabbinical saying, 'The first God is the true God, but the second god is Sammael.' We may also compare some words of Irenaeus:- "They (the Valentinians) further teach that the spirits of wickedness derived their origin from grief. Hence the devil, whom they also call κοσμοκράτωρ, and the demons, and the angels, and every wicked spiritual being that exists, found the source of their existence." (Against Heresies, Bk.I.V.4.).

The Greek of this passage may be construed in an altogether different manner ---- ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων --- "in whom God has blinded the minds of the unbelievers of this world." This rendering was adopted by Irenaeus,

Origen, Chrysostom, Tertullian, and Augustine, their exegesis being actuated by a desire to avoid anything which might give support to a Manichean doctrine.

The second passage in which Paul seems to be employing the language, and the exegesis, of contemporary Judaism occurs in the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

"Nor must we presume upon the Lord as some of them did, only to be destroyed by serpents. And you must not murmur, as some of them did, only to be destroyed by the Destroying Angel." (X.9,10. Moffatt's rendering.)

Here the Apostle is manifestly taking his illustrations from the story of the Israelites' wanderings as related in Numbers. The incident of the murmuring is to be found in Numbers XVI.41. --- "But on the morrow all the congregation of the children of Israel murmured against Moses and against Aaron, saying, Ye have killed the people of the Lord." The result of this murmuring was that a plague broke out amongst the people, causing a considerable number of deaths:- "Now they that died in the plague were fourteen thousand and seven hundred, besides them that died about the matter of Korah." According to Numbers there is nothing to suggest that this plague owed its origin to any other source than the Lord: Paul, on the other hand, says that they were destroyed

ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀποστόλου. As we have already frequently observed, later writers disliked attributing to God certain incongruous actions with which he had been causally connected in earlier writings. Some other agent or cause is now postulated: this could, of course, be either the angel of the Lord or the Angel of Death (identified with Satan in current thought.).

But are we justified in thinking that this apologetic midrash originated with Paul? It is more than likely that he borrowed the idea from some Jewish writing. Somewhat similar in character is that strange detail, in this same paragraph, regarding the moving rock from which they obtained their water while in the wilderness --- "Drinking from the supernatural rock which accompanied them." (X.4.). This picturesque legend did not see its origin with the Apostle: it was merely borrowed by him. Nor can we say with any confidence that he believed the truth of the legend: just as we cannot say that any of the expressions --- even those regarding Satan --- which he adopted from contemporary Judaism met with his full acceptance as literal truths. Edward's comment on the 'rock which followed' states the position in an excellent manner: "The use of the word ἀκολουθούσης shows that the

Apostle has in mind the rabbinical tradition that the rock smitten by Moses followed the Israelites through their wanderings. But it does not prove that he believed and gave his sanction to the legend (Alford) nor that he represents the water that gushed out of the rock as flowing by the side of the host during their march (Theod. Mops., Calvin, Estius, etc.). Both suppositions are inconsistent with Num. XXI. 5, 16. On the contrary the Apostle purposely adds, in order to obviate the inference that he believed the legend, and to introduce a beautiful allegorical use of it, that the true rock which followed the Israelites was Christ." (The First Epistle to the Corinthians, page 245.).

Did Paul ever identify the serpent of the Fall-story with Satan? We must answer in the negative, in spite of the arguments of Menzies and Thackeray. Only one passage need be considered --- the sole occasion on which Eve is mentioned in the New Testament. "I wish you would put up with a little 'folly' from me. Do put up with me, for I feel a divine jealousy on your behalf; I betrothed you as a chaste maiden to present you to your one husband Christ, but I am afraid of your thoughts getting seduced from a single devotion to Christ, just as the serpent beguiled Eve with his can-

ning." (II. Corinthians, XI. 1-3, following Moffatt's rendering). Here we must note that no mention is made of Satan, no hint is whispered of a supreme power of evil: not even the angel of Job flits across the screen. All we have is a simple allusion to Genesis III. And yet Thackeray can write:- "There are, then, in the opinion of the present writer, very strong grounds for presuming an acquaintance on the part of St. Paul with the Rabbinical legend." (The Relation of St. Paul to Contemp. Jewish Thought, page 55.). "We know that St. Paul followed the common view of his time ----- in identifying the serpent of Genesis with Satan." (above, page 54.). Having said all this, Thackeray makes the distressing error of giving the incorrect references to the above passage ---- not once, but twice (pages 55 and 172) mentioning it as I. Corinthians, XI. 2-3. !! Plummer (I.C.C. in loc.) is of the opinion that St. Paul did not know about this legend, concluding with the very pertinent remark:- "Assuming that he knew it, there is no evidence that he believed it. He uses legends as illustrations of truth; see on I. Cor. X. 4."

Paul seems to have been acquainted with the Myth of the Watchers, according to the common interpretation of a passage of abnormal difficulty. Writing of the veiling of women, he says:- "For this cause ought the woman to

have a covering on her head because of the angels." (I. Corinthians, XI.10.). Most commentators have seen in this a reference to the 'sons of God' of Genesis VI., who in the LXX are called οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ . The development of the myth, and the wealth of detail which it accumulated, we have already dealt with. All we propose to mention is that it was thought that the Watchers were especially intrigued by the beauty of the forms and the hair of the daughters of men. Thus in the Targum Jer. I. we read, "The sons of the great saw that the daughters of men were beautiful and painted and curled." In a similar manner we may quote as a parallel a passage from the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs:- "Flee, therefore, fornication, my children, and command your wives and your daughters, that they adorn not their heads and faces to deceive the mind: because every woman who useth these wiles hath been reserved for eternal punishment. For thus they allured the Watchers who were before the flood; for as these continually beheld them, they lusted after them, and they conceived the act in their mind; for they changed themselves into the shape of men, and appeared to them when they were with their husbands." (Test. Reuben, V. 5,6.). Tertullian's attitude towards this passage has already been discussed in our

section on the Ethiopic Enoch (pp 104-5.).

In attempting a summary of Paul's teaching, it should be noted that he always prefers the word 'Satan.' He employs the term in two different senses, and in the majority of instances Satan closely resembles the Old Testament figure --- a spirit of temptation or opposition, whose actions seem to be directed by God.

At the same time we may note that Paul appears to be aware of the current conceptions of Satan, even to the idea of the Satans. He employs contemporary legends in his arguments, but nowhere does he indicate his belief in them; nor does he identify the serpent with Satan. He normally associates evil with something within man: only one passage reflects anything in the nature of dualism, and this permits of an entirely different interpretation. A knowledge of the Myth of the Watchers is apparently presupposed.

CHAPTER IX.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

From the point of view of our special study, the Pastoral Epistles manifest one striking feature. On no less than three different occasions the word διάβολος ---- always without the definite article --- is used

in its full Classical sense. On each of these three occasions it can admit of no other translation than 'slanderer.' The passages in question are as follows:-

(a). I. Timothy, III.11. "Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things."

(b). II. Timothy, III.3. "For men shall be lovers of self ----- without natural affection, implacable, slanderers, without self-control, fierce."

(c). Titus, II.3. "That aged women likewise be reverent in demeanour, not slanderers nor enslaved to much wine, teachers of that which is good."

It is worthy of note that there seem to be no other examples in the New Testament of δῆβoλoς being used in this sense. There are, it is true, other examples of the term being used without the definite article, but these seem to have affinities with the so-called LXX force of the word, i.e. 'enemy.' For this see our comments on the verse, "Did I not choose you the twelve, and one of you is a δῆβoλoς."

This word is used on three other occasions in the Pastoral Epistles, and on each occasion it is accompanied by the definite article. Two of these are very similar:-

(a). I. Timothy, III.7. "Moreover he (the bishop) must have good testimony from them that are without: lest

he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil."

(b). II. Timothy, II. 26. "They may come to their senses again and escape the snare of the devil, as they are brought back to life by God to do his will." (Moffatt.).

Reviewing these two passages, our first consideration must be that in the LXX of Job, διάβολος is the regular translation of 70V. Need this snare be anything worse than one of those many trials which serve merely to test a man's worth? Possibly not; but it should be noted that the writer of the Pastorals employs both Σατανᾶς and διάβολος, and that he probably used this latter word in its more evil sense. In view of this suggestion, we should now enquire whether we meet with anything in the apocalyptic literature which resembles this 'snare of the devil.' It is in the Fragments of a Zadokite Work that we shall find our parallels:- "And during all these years Belial shall be let loose against Israel, as God spake through Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amos, saying: 'Fear and the pit and the snare are upon thee, O inhabitant of the land.' This means the three nets Of Belial, concerning which Levi the son of Jacob spake, by which he caught Israel and directed their faces to three kinds of wickedness." (VI.9-11.). Here it would seem as though the

idea of the 'three nets of Belial' were not absent from the mind of the writer of the Pastoral Epistles when he mentioned his 'snare of the devil.'

In view of this, it is highly significant that in the Pastorals we should meet with a reference to the magicians of Pharaoh:- "And like as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also withstand the truth; men corrupted in mind, reprobate concerning the faith." (II. Timothy, III.8.). Apart from the later Babylonian Talmud, these two figures are not mentioned in any literature other than the Zadokite Fragments, where we read that "Belial raised Jochanneh and his brother with his evil device when the former (Moses) delivered Israel." (VIII.19.).

With this 'snare of the devil' we may also compare a passage in the Wisdom of Ben-Sirach:- "For thou wast my protector and helper, and didst deliver my body out of destruction, and out of the snare of a slanderous tongue --- (καὶ ἐκ παγίδος διαβολῆς γλώσσης.)" (LI.2.).

The last instance of the word διάβολος being used in the Pastorals also appears in the section dealing with the qualifications of a bishop. "He must not be a new convert, in case he gets conceited and incurs the doom passed on the devil." (I. Timothy, III.6, following

Moffatt's rendering.). Now we must enquire into the nature of this κρίμα τοῦ διαβόλου. Various interpretations are possible; the genitive may be either subjective or objective. Taking the latter with Moffatt, also Chrysostom, Pelagius, Calvin, Bengel, we may look back to the LXX of Zechariah III, where we find that the Lord says to Satan:- "The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan." But this is more in the nature of a reproof than a condemnation, which Satan has brought upon himself through presumption. This, however, or pride, seems to be the cause of offence which must be avoided; and it is interesting to note that in contemporary literature the fall of Satan was thought to be due to pride (vide Slavonic Enoch, XXX.).

Another interpretation of this passage is "some judgment which the devil passes," regarding the genitive as being subjective. This is a most tenable form of exegesis, for as early as the Book of Job Satan appeared as an accuser. Nor need he be regarded as either a false accuser or as an altogether evil accuser, for the 'new convert', being only human, would be liable to feelings of pride at his sudden advancement. It must be remembered that the language is of an entirely figurative nature; and by 'the devil' little more need be indicated than the spirit of accusation.

Weiss and some others have made the brilliant suggestion that διαβόλος here is used generically of human earthly accusers. It is not difficult to conjecture that any 'new convert', suddenly made a bishop, would soon be unfortunate enough to find plenty who would not trouble to conceal his faults. Any pride which he might manifest would not likely be passed over in silence by his acquaintances.

The word Satan appears twice in the Pastoral Epistles. One of these refers to a primitive form of excommunication:- "Of whom is Hymenaeus and Alexander; whom I delivered unto Satan, that they might be taught not to blaspheme." (I. Timothy, 1.19.). This bears a very close resemblance to I. Corinthians, V.5, and our comments on the one will apply equally well to the other. All that need be added is to affirm that there need be indicated here no conception more highly-developed than that which is found in the Book of Job.

The remaining instance of the use of the term Satan would also seem to be akin to that in Job: for the idea implicit is that of temptation. "So I prefer young widows to marry again, to bear children, to look after their households, and not to afford our opponents any chance of reviling us. As it is, some widows have

already turned after Satan." (I. Timothy, V. 14,15.) (Moffatt.). That the language is metaphorical seems to be obvious; the thought expressed is that the widows have yielded to temptation. Perhaps we can find a parallel in I. Corinthians, VII.5 --- "You must not let Satan tempt you to incontinence." It is a fact, worthy of comment, that on these two occasions when the writer of the Pastorals uses the word 'Satan' ---- a term characteristic of the Pauline Epistles ---- then does he also utter sentiments which find their parallels in those epistles.

That tendency to discover references to the Devil where no such references exist has led many to misinterpret some words in the first part of the quotation which has just been given. *διδόναι τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ* has been thought to mean "to give to the devil," whereas the context indicates clearly that some earthly opponent is ~~indicated~~ intended. The English Versions are in some sense to be held responsible for this error, causing, as they do, many readers to associate 'the adversary' of this passage with a verse from I. Peter -- "For your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." A closer study of the original Greek would have obviated this false

association, for whereas I. Timothy employs the word ἀντικείμενος, I. Peter reads ἀντίδικος. The Vulgate, however, reads 'adversarius' in both passages.

As is well known, the 'Biblical Antiquities' of Philo have come down to us by means of an Old Latin Version. Philo does not mention Satan by name in this work, but in the section dealing with the story of the Levite from Judges, we suddenly meet with the strange sentence:- "And the Lord said unto the Adversary: 'Seest thou how this foolish people is disturbed?'" (XLV.6.). Here, in the Latin, the word for 'Adversary' is 'Anticiminus,' which M.R.James very rightly regards as being nothing more than a transliteration of ἀντικείμενος. Two points of interest arise from this. Firstly, if this is a reference to Satan, we may note that Philo adopts a position identical with that of the writer of the Book of Job. And, secondly, what were the doubts in the mind of the translator of the Old Latin, leading him to transliterate rather than to translate?

CHAPTER X.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

There is only one reference to Satan in this book.

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil: and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." (II. 14,15.). The word employed in the original Greek is διάβολος, as would be expected with a writer who seems to be so greatly indebted to the LXX. This indebtedness is clearly to be seen from the fact that eight of the Old Testament quotations in this epistle agree with the LXX where the latter differs from the Hebrew. As to the sense in which the word is used we may safely conjecture that it contains little of its Classical meaning of 'slanderer'; but that it represents the conception of Satan as developed by the apocalyptic writers.

Here, then, we have Satan depicted as being the Lord of Death. This conception is rare in the New Testament, although, according to one school of interpreters, we might find some slight parallel in the reference to excommunication in I. Corinthians, V.--- "To deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, in order that the spirit may be saved." (verse 5.). We may also compare some words from a difficult passage in the Fourth Gospel:- "Ye are of

your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him." (VIII. 44.). In earlier and contemporary Jewish literature this conception is by no means rare, and it is frequently to be seen manifesting itself in the apocalyptic writings. Some of these manifestations must now be examined in detail.

The Ethiopic Enoch seems to follow the attitude of the Book of Wisdom, viz: that man was created to be immortal. "Because God made not death; neither delighteth he when the living perish; for he created all things that they might have being." (Wisdom, I. 13,14.). "Because God created man for incorruption, and made him an image of his own proper being." (Wisdom, II. 24.). According to the Ethiopic Enoch, man lost his righteousness through the evil knowledge introduced by the Satans or fallen angels. "For men were created exactly like the angels, to the intent that they should continue pure and righteous, and death, which destroys everything, could not have taken hold of them, but through this their knowledge they are perishing, and through this their power it is consuming me." (Enoch, LXIX. 11.). In the same writing we also observe traces of the theory that

man can incur death, more especially that of a sudden nature, through his own wicked deeds. "Woe to you who write down lying and godless words; for they write down their lies that men may hear them and act godlessly towards their neighbour. Therefore they shall have no peace but die a sudden death." (XCVIII. 15,16.).

In the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch physical death is attributed to the Fall of Adam, the beginning of sin:-
"For what did it profit Adam that he lived nine hundred and thirty years, and transgressed that which he was commanded? Therefore the multitude of time that he lived did not profit him, but brought death and cut off the years of those who were born from him." (XVII. 2,3.).
"Because when Adam sinned and death was decreed against those who should be born, then the multitude of those who should be born was numbered, and for that number a place was prepared where the living might dwell and the dead might be guarded." (XXIII. 4.).

Death is sometimes traced back to the woman, as in the Wisdom of Ben-Sirach:- "From a woman was the beginning of sin; and because of her we all die." (XXV. 24.). The same teaching is found in the Talmud. "This doctrine of man's conditional immortality and of death entering into the world through sin does not belong to the O. T. literature, for Genesis II.17, when studied in its context,

implies nothing more than a premature death; for the law of man's being is enunciated in Genesis III. 19.

'Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return,' and his expulsion from Eden was due first and principally to the need of guarding against his eating of the tree of life and living for ever. Furthermore, even in Sirach, where the idea of death as brought about by sin is first enunciated, the doctrine appears in complete isolation, and in open contradiction to the main statements and tendencies of the book; for it elsewhere teaches that man's mortality is the law from everlasting (~~ἡ γὰρ διαθήκη ἀπ' αἰῶνος~~ Sirach XIV.17.): and that being formed from earth unto earth must he return, XVII. 1,2., XL.11. Nor again is this doctrine a controlling principle in the system of the writers of Wisdom. In N.T. times, however, we find it the current view in the Pauline Epistles, e.g. Rom. V.12; I.Cor. XV. 21; II. Cor. XI. 3." (Forbes and Charles, 2 Enoch, in Apoc. and Pseud-epigrapha of the O.T., Vol.II., page 450.).

A further example of the theory that death is to be traced to the woman may be seen in the Slavonic Book of Enoch:- "For I have seen his nature, but he has not seen his own nature, therefore through not seeing he will sin worse, and I said: 'After sin what is there but death?' And I put sleep into him and he fell asleep.

And I took from him a rib, and created him a wife, that death should come to him by his wife, and I took his last word and called her name mother, that is to say, Eva." (XXX. 16-18.)

Having thus observed that death has been shown to be a legacy from the transgression of Adam, we may now investigate the theories as to the cause of this transgression. Nowhere in the Old Testament do we find any identification of the cause with anything other than the serpent of Genesis III. But, as we have already seen, several attempts were made in the literature of the apocalyptic period to identify Satan with the serpent. Thus, in the Slavonic Book of Enoch and the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch, we meet with a complete identification of the two; while in the reconstruction of the Assumption of Moses we have seen good reasons for suspecting that Satan was held to have inspired the serpent. A complete identification of the serpent and Satan occurs twice in the Book of Revelation (XII. 9, XX. 2.).

Conflating these current conceptions it is an easy matter to see how Satan came to be regarded as the Lord of Death. In the literature of later Judaism the angel of death became a familiar figure, and in a well-known passage of the Talmud he was identified with Satan.

"Resh Lakish said: Satan, the evil prompter, and the Angel of Death are all one. ---- The same is also the Angel of Death since it (Job, II.) says, 'Only spare his life,' which shows that Job's life belonged to him." (Baba Bathra, 16a.). Here we should also observe that the 'evil inclination' is identified with the Angel of Death; this leads us back to the old position manifested in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch, viz: that death may be traced to that evil lurking in men's hearts.

And now, having investigated these parallels in Jewish literature, our attention must be directed towards the passage as it stands in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Here we are given a reason for the Incarnation: our Lord became flesh and dwelt amongst us in order that he might die. The object of his death was that through death, and through resurrection, he might defeat death, that 'he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.' Here the original Greek must be studied: τὸν τὸ θάνατον ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου. How is the participle to be translated? Jerome has no qualms on this point; "qui habebat mortis imperium," a rendering which is followed by our Authorised Version:-- "that had the power of death." But those responsible

for the Revised Version, paying, as was their wont, rather too much attention to the rules of elementary Greek grammar, substituted a present participle --- 'that hath the power of death.' In Greek, however, the present participle can represent either the present tense or the imperfect. In other words can mean either 'him that hath' or 'him that had.' The alternative translation is given in the Margin.

Manifestly it is this marginal rendering which is correct; for if the Devil still 'hath the power of death,' then perforce has the Incarnation failed to attain its object. These deductions may be carried still further: the Incarnation and the Resurrection deprived the Devil of his power. No harder verse than this can anywhere be found in Holy Scripture for those who uphold a belief in an active, potent, personal Devil. To make this point altogether clear, let us reduce our argument to the form of the logical syllogism:-

The object of the Incarnate Lord was to defeat Satan.

The Incarnate Lord attained his object.

Therefore Satan was defeated.

Perhaps now we are in such a position that we can attempt to throw a little light on a problem in the Book of Revelation. In Chapter I. we read that John, in

the Spirit on the Lord's day, saw the vision of 'one like unto the Son of Man.' John falls prostrate at his feet. "And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, 'Fear not; I am the first and the last: I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and death." (verses 17 and 18.). From this we can gather that, among some at least, there was accepted the theory that the Devil was no longer the Lord of Death. The control of death was now in the hands of the Risen Lord.

There is, of course, no suggestion made that physical death could no longer assail human beings. The control over death has been changed; and man's attitude towards death has been changed. The fear of the End has passed away: for it there has been substituted the hope in the Beginning of the new life. This thought clearly emerges in the passage from Hebrews at present under consideration:- "And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." Men were to be set free, not from the necessity of death, but from the dread of death. Westcott very happily compares with this Romans VIII.21.

"Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God."

CHAPTER XI.

THE EPISTLES OF JAMES, PETER, AND JUDE.

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

The reader of this epistle who hopes to find manifested a clearly defined doctrine of an external and personal Devil is destined to deep disappointment. For him, as for one other reader who hoped to find a doctrine of faith without works, it will be 'an epistle of straw.' It is the most Jewish in outlook of all the New Testament writings; so much so, in fact, that Spitta was led to suggest that this was a Jewish document rendered Christian by means of two small interpolations. Even in its doctrine of evil we can see reflected a philosophy which was popular in contemporary Judaism. This is a tendency to find the source of evil within the man; to identify it with something internal, that 'evil imagination' that is situated in every human heart.

External evils are attributed to internal lusts.

"From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come

they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?" (IV.1.). "Do ye think that the Scripture saith, in vain, The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy?" (IV.5.). This seems to be a quotation from the Old Testament, but no passage exactly resembles it. Perhaps the nearest parallel is a passage on which the doctrine of the 'evil imagination' was later to be based:- "And the Lord smelled a sweet savour: and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake: for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more everything living, as I have done." (Genesis, VIII. 21.). In associating this passage with the words from Genesis we have followed the translation as given in the Authorised Version, a rendering which seems to harmonise best with the philosophy of the epistle. It must, however, be observed that other renderings are possible, such as those suggested in the Revised Version. These would interpret the passage as referring to God's yearning for man's love, or that God's Spirit, indwelling in man through Christ, craves his undivided love.

This philosophy of evil is apparent in the writer's attitude towards temptation (*πειρασμός*). Temptation, it will be agreed, always implies a tempter. But if

the Epistle of James relegates the source of evil to an inner domain within the human heart, then it is from within that temptation should come. Such an attitude is stated by the writer in no uncertain terms:- "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man. But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." (I. 13 - 15.). Here, it seems obvious, the source of temptation would seem to be identical with the 'evil imagination.' Sooner or later, the yielding to temptation results in death. And the evil manifests itself and finds its expression in the realisation of lust. A good parallel to this may be seen in the Wisdom of Ben-Sirach:- "Say not thou, It is through the Lord that I fell away, for thou shalt not do the things he hateth. Say not thou, It is he that caused me to err, for he hath no need of a sinful man." (XV. 11,12.). Parallels may be seen also in the apocalyptic writings, and never so well as in that interpretation of the Fall of the Watchers as given in the Zadokite Fragments. "And not to go about in the thoughts of an evil imagination, and

with eyes full of fornication ----- Because they walked in the stubbornness of their heart the Watchers of heaven fell. By them were they caught because they kept not the commandment of God." (III. 2-4.).

This testing or tempting, then, comes from within. No dualistic theories of an external tempter are allowed. And even temptation itself is not entirely evil; it has a disciplinary function, for the act of resisting inculcates patience. "My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations; knowing this, that the trying of your faith worketh patience." (I. 2,3.). The great virtue of patience is revealed in the mighty figures of the Old Testament. "Take, my brethren, the prophets, who have spoken in the name of ~~the~~ the Lord, for an example of suffering affliction, and of patience. Behold, we count them happy which endure. Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord; that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy." (V. 10,11.).

It is significant that the writer should mention the patience of Job, for this implies that he associates intimately, or even identifies, the figure of the Satan with the call of a man's inner and less noble desires. Perhaps we may justify this interpretation

of the philosophy embodied in the Epistle of James by reducing our argument to a more logical form.

(a). Job was patient. (V.11.).

(b). Patience is the result of resisting temptation
(I. 2,3.).

(c). Temptation is the urge of the 'evil imagination.'
(I. 14.).

(d). The temptation of Job was the urge of the Satan.
(Job, I.).

Therefore the urge of the Satan is the urge of the
'evil imagination.'

Therefore the Satan is the 'evil imagination.'

Nor do we lack parallels to our conclusion. First of all we have the well-known dictum of Ben-Sirach, a sentiment which is reflected throughout the entire book:- "When the ungodly curseth Satan, he curseth his own soul." (XXI. 27.). Secondly, we may turn to the Talmud, to a saying which we have been forced to quote on previous occasions:- "Satan, the evil prompter, and the angel of death are all one." From these we may safely conclude that, in certain quarters at least, the identification of Satan with the 'evil imagination' was not rejected.

The passage from the Talmud is interesting, associating, as it does, the 'evil imagination' with death. A somewhat similar association is to be observed in James:- "When lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." (I. 15.).

Now we are duly prepared to approach the single passage in this epistle where mention is made of the Devil. "Submit yourselves therefore to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you. Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you. Cleanse your hands, ye sinners, and purify your hearts, ye double-minded." (IV. 7,8.). Here, there seems but little doubt, the Devil means the tempter. And already we have seen good reasons for suspecting that the tempter and the 'evil imagination' are closely akin to one another. The word employed in the Greek is διάβολος, a term whose associations with tempting or testing are well-known. In Job, for instance, the Satan of the Hebrew became ὁ διάβολος of the LXX. In the narrative of the Temptation of Jesus, both Matthew and Luke employ ὁ διάβολος. In this passage of James, it should be noted, the definite article is to be found. There are no grounds to warrant any such translation as:- "Resist an (earthly) slanderer or enemy and he will flee away;" nor is any such translation required, for we are dealing with something psychological rather than physical. Along with this passage we should study the writer's injunction to the resisting of temptation:- "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he

shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him." (I. 12.).

Minute attention may well be paid to the actual wording of the Greek text at this point:—ἀντίστητε δὲ τῷ διαβόλῳ, καὶ φεύξεσθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. To this we can find a close parallel, not only as regards thoughts, but also as regards words, in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs:— "If ye work that which is good, my children, both men and angels shall bless you; and God shall be glorified among the Gentiles through you, and the devil shall flee from you --- ὁ διάβολος φεύξεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν "(Test. Naphtali, VIII. 4.).

In the introduction to this essay we reproduced the definition of the word 'Devil' in the New English Dictionary. Little of this definition would hold good so far as the Epistle of James is concerned; but least of all that section which reads:— "The foe of God and holiness." The enemy of God is mentioned, but this enemy is most certainly not Satan. Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." (IV. 4.). It rests with man to choose which of his inclinations he will follow: and if he obeys the dictates of his 'evil inclination,' he will find that the world of pleasure to which he turns

is likely to treat him with hostility at a later date. The world is one of the mediums through which the 'evil inclination' expresses itself. "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." (I. 27.).

THE EPISTLES OF PETER.

These epistles contain little which has any bearing upon our investigations. There is only one reference to the Devil or Satan, a passage rendered familiar through its presence in the Office of Compline. "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour. Whom resist, steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world." (I. Peter, V. 8,9.).

There are several varying conceptions underlying this passage, and these we must now examine in detail. Firstly, we are told that the Devil 'walketh about;'; this is undoubtedly a conception based on the Book of Job. ---- "And the Lord said unto Satan, Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the Lord and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and

down in it." (Job, I. 7.).

Secondly, the Devil is compared to a 'roaring lion' ὡς λέων ὠρυόμενος. This conception seems to have been taken from the LXX of Psalm XXI (XXII), 14. ---- "They gaped upon me with their mouths, as a ravening and roaring lion." (ὡς λέων ὁ ἄρπάζων καὶ ὠρυόμενος).

Thirdly, the words 'your adversary the devil' present, in the Greek, a strange phenomenon --- ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος . The apparent absence of the definite article has led many to suggest that διάβολος has now become almost a personal name. This is not an entirely justifiable explanation: and we shall have the temerity to suggest that ἀντίδικος here possesses an adjectival force, ὑμῶν being an objective genitive. The expression could now be rendered:- "the adversary who prosecutes you." In the Books of Job and Zechariah, it will be remembered, the Satan (LXX. διάβολος) appeared as a prosecuting adversary.

Fourthly, is this a false or slanderous accusation which is indicated? Now as we have often pointed out, διάβολος in Classical Greek did regularly mean a slanderer. And in the LXX it has been shown that the abstract noun διαβολή could sometimes mean slander. In the Book of Daniel this latter term was used on certain occasions to represent the Aramaic expression

for slandering, viz: 'to eat the pieces.'

May we not have here the true explanation of the words 'seeking whom he may devour'? In Syriac 'the eater of the pieces' (ܐܝܬܐ ܕܠܚܝܡܐ) became a regular expression for Satan as the slanderer par excellence. (Vide Payne Smith, "Thesaur: Syr:"). We should therefore suggest that the entire passage runs somewhat as follows. "For your prosecuting Adversary, like a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may slander."

The idea implicit seems to be that there is much persecution to be faced. That this persecution, like the sufferings of Job, was something sent to test their worth. It did not originate from some force which was altogether evil and dualistically opposed to God; rather was it κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ (IV. 19.). This persecution, inflicted through the agency of the Satan, must be resisted; for he was ready, as in Job and Zechariah, to fulfil his other function, viz: that of prosecuting in the heavenly courts.

"Whom resist, steadfast in the faith." Here the Greek reads ἀνίστητε. This word appeared in a similar context in the Epistle of James, and our notes

on that example apply equally well here (vide pages 258 and 259 of this essay.).

In the Second Epistle of Peter we have a manifest reference to the Myth of the Watchers. "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." (II.4.). This definitely re-echoes the teaching of the Ethiopic Enoch, as may be seen from the following parallel passages:-

(a). "And again he said to Raphael: 'Bind Azazel hand and foot and cast him into the darkness: and make an opening in the desert, which is in Dudael, and cast him therein. And place upon him rough and jagged rocks, and cover him with darkness, and let him abide there for ever, and cover his face that he may not see light. And on the day of the great judgment he shall be cast into the fire.'" (Enoch, X. 4-6.).

(b). "And the Lord said unto Michael: 'Go bind Semjaza and his associates who have united themselves with women so as to have defiled themselves with them in their uncleanness. ----- In those days they shall be led off to the abyss of fire: and to the torment and the prison in which they shall be confined for

ever. And whosoever shall be condemned and destroyed will from henceforth be bound together with them to the end of all generations." (Enoch, X. 11 -14.).

THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

This epistle has but a small contribution to make towards the development of the idea of a personal Devil. There is only one reference to the Devil or Satan, the word employed in the original Greek being διάβολος . . . The passage in question runs as follows:- "Yet in like manner these also in their dreamings defile the flesh, and set at nought dominion, and rail at dignitaries. But Michael the archangel, when contending with the Devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing judgment, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." (verses 8 and 9.).

The thought underlying these words looks back to the real Assumption of Moses, an apocalyptic work that no longer exists, although scholars have been able, from references and quotations in other writings, to reconstruct the text to a very large extent. This we have dealt with in detail in the course of our examination of the Apocalyptic Literature. That this incident was taken from the lost Assumption of Moses we

learn from the statements of Clement of Alexandria (Adumb. in Ep. Judae), Origen (de Princip. III.2.), and Didymus.

The Devil as here depicted is a figure of apocalyptic thought, rather than of the New Testament. And in no way can he be said to resemble the Satan of Job and Zechariah. Here is evil and hostile; from the reconstructed text we can gather that he claimed to be the Lord of Matter, and that it was on these grounds that he laid claim to the body of Moses. Evidence of this is provided by the following quotation from an anonymous writing in Cramer's Catena in Epist. Cathol. page 160. ὁ γὰρ διάβολος αὐτῆς ἐλθὼν ἀπατήσας, ὅτι ἐμὸν τὸ σῶμα ὡς τῆς ὑλῆς δεσπόζοντι.

The words 'the Lord rebuke thee' are worthy of minute investigation. As we have mentioned in a previous chapter, these words are met with in Zechariah, when Satan was pictured as bringing an accusation against Joshua the High Priest, and was duly rebuked by God. "And the Lord said unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee." (Zechariah, III.2.). In later Judaism these words seem to have been

regarded as a charm against the attacks of Satan. The Jews went so far as to write them on tablets and to secure these to the side-posts and doors of their dwellings (vide Guillaume, Prophecy and Divination, page 266.). A similar conception is revealed in the Talmud, where we read of the distressing adventure of Pelimo. He, it seems, was in the habit of saying every day 'An arrow in Satan's eyes.' Now as ill luck would have it, on one occasion Satan happened to be present, with the result that he heard this impolite wish. The unfortunate Pelimo decided upon an immediate retreat ----"Fleeing, he hid in a privy. Satan followed him and Pelimo fell before him." But the worst did not happen; and the conclusion of the story is somewhat of an anti-climax. "Satan said, You should say, 'The Merciful rebuke thee, Satan.'" (Kiddushim, 81a, translations from the Soncino Edition.)

It will have been observed that Michael the archangel here appears in his favourite role of Satan's adversary. The Apocalyptic Books refer to this on very many occasions; and here Michael always appears as the champion of Israel against Satan. The germs of this conception may be seen in Daniel (X.13,21; XII. 1.), the only book of the Old Testament to make

mention of Michael. In spite of the prevalence of this belief in contemporary Judaism, little is to be seen of it in the New Testament. It is, perhaps, rather significant that apart from this passage in Jude, itself borrowed from an apocalyptic work, our only other reference to Michael should be in the Book of Revelation, the one writing of the New Testament to be deeply dyed with the peculiar characteristics of current apocalyptic. Here, as would be expected, we find Michael depicted as fighting against the Devil. "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world." (XII. 7-9.).

This little Epistle of Jude is interesting on account of its being, in its attitude towards the Fall of man, the one writing of the New Testament which most reflects traces of the myth of the Watchers. As is well known, there were two main theories held about the Fall in the Judaism of the immediate pre-Christian era. The Fall was identified either with the sin of the Watchers, or with the transgression of Adam. Of the two, the latter became the more popular, and it was

this which was later adopted by Christianity "and welded so firmly into the dogmatic structure of our religion, that succeeding ages have taken it for granted as one of the central pillars and supports of the Church's Faith." (N.P.Williams, The Ideas of the Fall, page 95.). It was solely on the Adamic theory that Paul based his Fall-teaching; and it is only in the Second Epistle of Peter, and the Epistle of Jude, that we discern traces of any definite allegiance to the Watcher-theory. The following quotation will make this point clear:- "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day. Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, in like manner giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." (Jude, 6,7.).

As with the incident of Satan claiming the body of Moses, no less with this reference to the Myth of the Watchers, we have good reasons for suspecting that the writer of Jude is borrowing from some earlier work. In this instance the source seems to have been none other than the Ethiopic Book of Enoch. We find an excellent parallel in Chapter XII.4. to the verses which

we have quoted above:- "Enoch, thou scribe of righteousness, go, declare to the Watchers of the heaven who have left the high heaven, the holy eternal place, and have defiled themselves with women, and have done as the children of earth do, etc." Again, we find a parallel to the descriptions of the punishment of the Watchers in Chapter X., where we read of the fate which is to overtake Azazel, a passage which we have had occasion to quote in our study of the Epistles of Peter.

Yet a further proof of Jude's indebtedness to contemporary apocalyptic is to be seen from the fact that in verses 14 and 15 he gives a direct quotation from the Ethiopic Enoch, referring to its pseudepigraphic author by name:- "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." That this is a direct quotation becomes perfectly obvious when the following verses of Enoch are read in parallel:- "And behold! He cometh with ten thousands of his

holy ones, to execute judgment upon all, and to destroy all the ungodly: and to convict all flesh of all the works of their ungodliness which they have ungodly committed, and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against him."(I. 9.).

We have already indicated that the reference to the Devil has been taken from the lost Assumption of Moses. Now we may add that Jude 16 has undoubtedly been compiled from various passages in the extant portions of this same work. This we have dealt with in full detail in our section on the Assumption of Moses.

To sum up our investigations of the Epistle of Jude we may say that, although we do meet with one reference to the Devil, it is of such a nature that no doctrinal value has ever been assigned to it. The entire epistle manifests many traces of apocalyptic influences: so many, indeed, that we feel somewhat surprised to find that there is but one reference to the Devil. From this epistle we also learn that the Myth of the Watchers had not, as yet, been completely discarded as a Fall-theory.

CHAPTER XII.

THE JOHANNINE GOSPEL AND EPISTLES

At the outset it should be mentioned that the word Σατανᾶς appears once only throughout the whole of this literature, διάβολος being the favourite expression in the Gospel, while both διάβολος and ἀντίχριστος are used in the Epistles ---- although we make no suggestion that the last refers to Satan.

Immediately before the section dealing with the washing of the disciples' feet, we read:- "And supper being ended, (the devil - διάβολος - having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him)" (XIII. 2.). In the same chapter there is recorded the incident of the sop:- "And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon. And after the sop, Satan entered into him." (verse 27.). It is hardly likely, more especially in view of the fact that the perfect participle was employed in the former reference (ἤδη βεβλημένος), that the writer would insert two references to the Devil entering into Judas, and it seems to be highly probable that the second has been borrowed from Luke. Perhaps we have here a marginal gloss which has been incorporated into the text. But when

investigating this explanation it must be borne in mind that the words 'after the sop' were not taken from Luke, the term ψωμίον not occurring elsewhere in the New Testament, apart from this Johannine passage.

John, as did Luke, took the offence of the betrayal a step further back. For them Judas was not so much the cause as the agent. This tendency we have already observed at work in other writings, and it seems likely that John in his former reference is thinking of a personal power of evil rather than of any mere spirit of temptation. We know that, in many of the writings of the apocalyptic period, the Jews were approaching some form of dualism; and no portion of the New Testament seems so reminiscent of this as do the Johannine writings. Here we seem to have that violent contrast between the kingdoms of light and darkness, truth and falsehood, freedom and bondage. And here also we have a direct opposition of Christ, the Saviour of the world, and the Devil, the prince of this world. Such is the attitude of many modern scholars; it now remains for us to see whether this theory holds good with reference to the teaching on the Devil.

In the first place, the use of the word διάβολος

rather than *Σαρανός* is significant, for this term had received both from Classical Greek and from the LXX an evil connotation. But we are slightly handicapped by the fact that the word occurs no more than three times in the Gospel. One of these examples we have already discussed, viz. the Devil being responsible for the offence of Judas. And here, as has been remarked, the dualistic interpretation has much to commend it.

But regarding the other two examples of the use of the word, one presents very serious difficulties. In a section which may well be said to contain the nearest approach in the Fourth Gospel to anything resembling the incident at Caesarea Philippi in the Synoptists. Peter answers Jesus and says:- "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that thou art the Christ, the son of the living God. Jesus answered them, Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? He spake of Judas Iscariot the son of Simon: for it was he that should betray him, being one of the twelve." (VI. 68-71.). The Greek of this passage demands careful investigation:- *καὶ ἔξ ὑμῶν εἷς διάβολος ἐστίν*; the word *διάβολος* has not the definite article, and it is hardly likely that it means the Devil. As the text

stands, it must mean a devil. But this is somewhat obscure, for though we know what a demon connotes, we have little idea as to the connotation of a devil. Perhaps the happiest way out of our difficulties is to remember that Judas was merely a human being, and to suppose that the word δαίμονος is being used in the sense in which it appears in the LXX, viz: an 'earthly enemy.' This accords well with the facts, for Judas was indeed an enemy.

At the same time it must be remembered that in Matthew and Mark, in the incident at Caesarea Philippi, our Lord addresses Peter as Satan. In our comments on this we suggested that the word was being used in its Job sense, i.e. a spirit of temptation. But in the LXX δαίμονος is the regular rendering of the word Satan in Job and Zechariah. Can it be that John has directed the rebuke towards Judas, against whom he manifests so violent an animus? Although the context is so similar, it is not easy to accept this interpretation, for Judas ever seems to have been rather an earthly enemy than one whose offence lay in making tempting suggestions. Perhaps we had better conclude that in this passage at least there is no hint at any latent dualism.

In the remaining reference to the Devil we can

arrive at no such conclusions, for here the conflict between good and evil, between Christ and the Devil, clearly emerges. Our Lord has proclaimed himself to be the Light of the World: he has thrown the darkness into sharp contrast with the light of life. This has provoked the animosity of the Jews, and he tells them that they will die in their sins. The question of freedom arises, and the Jews haste to assert that they are free, because Abraham was their father. Later they are driven to abandon this argument; and now they begin to argue back to the position that God is their father. Our Lord retorts that if God were their father, then would they love him. "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it." (VIII. 44.).

Here, it cannot be denied, we have something which approximates very closely to dualism. They are opposed to Jesus. God is his father: the Devil is their father. And the manner in which, a little earlier, light was contrasted with darkness makes this dualism all the more apparent. The word *διαβολος* here indicates no Testing

Angel from the Book of Job; it looks back to something which is altogether evil, which has been evil from the beginning. The reference to the Devil being a murderer (ἀνθρωποκτόνος) seemingly refers to the murder of Abel by Cain, and parallels may be found in both Clement of Rome and Theophilus. Perhaps we should also see a reference here to that belief, popular in current Judaism, that death was the result of the Fall. The word ἀνθρωποκτόνος occurs once again in the Greek New Testament, in I. John, III. 15:- "Everyone that hateth his brother is a murderer. And ye know that no murderer has eternal life abiding in him." It is not without its significance that the Apostolic Constitutions (Book VIII, chap. VII.) should speak of the ἀνθρωποκτόνος ὄφης.

Associated with the Devil is all evil, including lying; for with him lying had its origin. Already, as we have seen, Satan and the serpent had been identified in the apocalyptic writings; and according to Genesis III. the serpent was the first liar.

The Greek of one part of this passage --- ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστε --- does, of course, permit another translation:- "You are of the father of the devil." In view of this certain scholars, including Hilgenfeld, have been led to suggest that

here we have embodied some traces of Gnostic teaching. That the Ophites held that Ialdabaoth, the God of the Jews, was the father of the serpent, may be seen from the "Against Heresies" of Irenaeus:-

"In these circumstances, he (Ialdabaoth) cast his eyes upon the subjacent dregs of matter, and fixed his desire upon it, to which they declare his son owes his origin. This son is Nous himself, twisted into the form of a serpent." ----- "They affirm that Ialdabaoth exclaimed, 'Come, let us make man after our image.' The six powers, on hearing this, and their mother furnishing them with the idea of a man (in order that by means of him she might empty them of their original power), jointly formed a man of immense size, both in regard to breadth and length. But as he could merely writhe along the ground, they carried him to their father." (Book I. chap. XXX. 5, 6.).

It may be added that this interpretation has been discarded by most modern scholars, including Bernard, who very pertinently remarks:- "Such a notion is not relevant to this context, the evangelist representing Jesus as telling the Jews plainly for the first time that they are the devil's children --- a climax to which the preceding verses have led up." (I.C.C. in loc.).

Many have seen a similar expression of this latent dualism in the expression 'the prince of this world,' a title of Satan met with three times in the Fourth Gospel, but not elsewhere in the New Testament. But the title 'the god of this world' occurs in II. Corinthians IV. 4, and Ephesians furnishes a reference to 'the prince of the power of the air' (II. 2.). (N.B. There is another possible translation of the passage from Corinthians, making it refer, not to Satan, but to God.). Parallels may be observed in contemporary apocalyptic, as well as in other Jewish writings. Thus, in the Ascension of Isaiah, Beliar is called 'the ruler of this world.' ----- "And of the eternal judgments and the torments of Gehenna, and of the prince of this world, and of his angels, and his authorities and his powers." (I. 3.). "And Manasseh turned aside his heart to serve Beliar; for the angel of lawlessness, who is the ruler of this world, is Beliar, whose name is Metanbuchus." (II. 4.). "And again he descended into the firmament where dwelleth the ruler of this world." (X. 29.). In contemporary Judaism 'the prince of the age' (מלך הזמן) was a favourite title for Satan or Sammael.

It should be carefully observed that in two of these Johannine passages we have references to the punishment

or judgment of the Devil. The dualism is not of an eternal nature; it is entirely transitory. "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out." (XII. 31.). "Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged." (XVI. 11.). In the remainxing passage, the opposition becomes more apparent. "Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me." (XIV. 30.). In these last words there is stressed not merely the conflict, but also the victory.

Much has been written on the sentence 'the prince of this world cometh.' Some have seen here a reference to Judas, accepting that theory which regards him as being, in the Fourth Gospel, little short of Satan incarnate. This theory is hardly tenable, for although the writer exhibits a peculiar hostility towards Judas, it cannot be said that he ventures to identify Satan with him. On the other hand, he does definitely tell us that Satan merely used Judas as his instrument by entering into his heart. A much better interpretation is to see here a reference, in language permeated by personification, to death. We have already noted that in current Judaism 'the ruler of this world (or age)' was but a synonym for Sammael; and Sammael was identified with the Angel of Death, as was Satan also (vide

Baba Bathra, 16a). Our Lord is speaking of his coming conflict with death; he does not hesitate to speak of his ultimate victory.

Along with this there should be read the sole reference to the Evil One in the Epistle to the Hebrews:- "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." (II. 14.). Here we have manifested that often neglected phenomenon of the New Testament, viz: that when we do meet with a reference to a personal Devil, then this is generally a Devil who is either defeated, or on the verge of defeat --- a Devil such as that mentioned in the verse of Berangar:- "Le diable est mort, le diable est mort."

The latent dualism to which we have referred is to be seen emerging in the First Epistle of John; and here the opposition seems to be - at times - between the Devil and God, rather than between the Devil and Christ. "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil." (III. 10.). Here it must be noted how similar is the thought to that of the Fourth Gospel --- "Ye are of your father the

devil." Again we have the teaching that the purpose of the Incarnation was the defeat of the Devil-----

"For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." (III. 8.).

Sin owes its origin to the Devil-----"He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning." (III. 8.). The words ἀρ' ἀρχῆς may well be regarded as indicating the conception that the Devil was at work in the Fall. And as we know, popular thought had already associated the serpent with Satan. It may also be conjectured that the Devil was held to have been in some way responsible for the first murder:--- "Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous." (III. 12.). Here there is a certain amount of ambiguity about the words ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ admitting, as they do, of a neuter translation -- "was of evil." But we have previously seen that on one occasion at least --- Matthew, XIII. 19. --- ὁ πονηρὸς is used of the Evil One. In view of the Greek words employed toward the end of this Johannine verse we should expect an adjective to be used predicatively if the idea underlying the second rendering were present in the writer's mind. Again, in the Fourth Gospel,

the Devil was called *ὁ ὑποβλεπόμενος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, a reference which was interpreted of Cain and Abel.

It may be that there are some other instances in the Johannine literature when *ὁ πονηρός* is used of the Devil. Thus the Revised Version gives the rendering:- "I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil one." (XVII. 15.). On the whole, it will be felt, this is a better rendering than that of the Margin --- "from evil". Bernard (I.C.C. in loc.) makes the following comment:- "The agency of the personal devil, Satan, is not doubted by John." A close parallel to this may be seen in I. John, V. 18:- "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not." Here again is present that prevailing note of dualism, howbeit a dualism which is coming to an end. Similar in tone is I. John, II. 14:- "I have written unto you, young men, because ye are strong, and the word of God abideth in you, and ye have overcome the wicked one." A corresponding conflict is postulated between the followers of Christ and the world --- this latter being regarded as permeated by the influence of the Evil One. "We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in the evil one." (I. John, V.

19, following the Revised Version's rendering of ἐν τῷ πνεύματι .).

The Johannine Epistles are the only writings of the New Testament in which the term Antichrist appears. In the past many attempts have been made to identify this Antichrist with Satan: but that such an interpretation cannot be tenable seems clear when these references are studied in their contexts. "Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know it is the last time." (I. John, II. 18.). "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." (I. John, II. 22.). "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already it is in the world." (I. John, IV. 3.). "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist." (II. John, 7.).

From a consideration of these passages two conclusions may be reached. Firstly, the ἀντίχριστος

of the Johannine Epistles has nothing to do with the ψευδοχριστος of the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew, XXIV. 24, Mark, XIII. 22.). Secondly, the Antichrist is not the Devil, but a collective name for the false teachers who have issued from the main body of the Church. This subject must now be examined in fuller detail.

THE ANTICHRIST MYTH.

As we have already stated, the expression 'Antichrist' does not appear until the time of the Johannine Epistles: but the underlying thought looks back to a much earlier period. It may well be observed emerging in the reference to Antiochus Epiphanes in Daniel XI. "And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself over every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished: for that that is determined shall be done. Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor regard any god: for he shall magnify himself above all. ----- And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him." (verses 36, 37, 45.).

Here we have the germs of the Antichrist idea: the coming of someone of human origin who is opposed to God and to God's people. In Daniel VIII --- the vision of the ram and the he-goat --- this conception is also to be seen. The he-goat's horn has been broken, and four horns begin to grow:- "And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them." (verses 9, 10.). This is a description, in symbolic language, of the assault of Antiochus Euphraphanes upon the heathen gods.

Later, in the Psalms of Solomon, we find that Pompey is mentioned in terms befitting the Antichrist. Thus, he is called 'the dragon'; 'the sinner'; and 'the lawless one.' The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch (XXXVI - XL) refers in similar language to Rome and the Emperors. These are also mentioned in II. Esdras V; there will come an Antichrist who is also Emperor of Rome. "And one whom the dwellers upon earth do not look for shall wield sovereignty." (verse 6.).

Summarising the evidence which we have assembled, we are enabled to arrive at two main conclusions:-

(a). The Antichrist is someone of human origin opposed to God.

(b). He is a Gentile, and not a Jew.

Turning to the Antichrist of the Johannine Epistles we may note that these conceptions have been somewhat modified. The word seems to indicate a deceiver, or any teacher of false doctrine who has come from the main body of Christians. There is no necessity that we should conclude that the Johannine Antichrist must be Jewish. Nor should the term be regarded as a synonym for Satan. At the worst it indicates one whose actions are inspired by the power of evil. It seems likely that a personal Antichrist is mentioned in the Fourth Gospel:- "If another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." (V. 43.).

CHAPTER XIII.

THE ACTS AND EPHESIANS

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

One of the many details in which the Acts resembles the Third Gospel is that in both we find *Σατανᾶς* and *διδύμος* used as names for the Evil One. In Acts both the terms occur twice; never in the actual narrative, but always in the words of some speaker. And here it is worthy of comment that in the Gospels

and Acts we find that whereas the Devil is mentioned 23 times in conversations or discourses, there are only 12 references to him in the actual narrative, 9 of these being concerned with the incident of the Temptation. From this it can with some justification be deduced that the Devil is largely a figure of speech.

The first example in this book to contain a reference to the Devil is the incident of Ananias and Sapphira. Some property has been sold, but Ananias gives only a part of the proceeds to the Church, keeping the balance for himself. Peter, on learning of this action, rebukes Ananias in the following words:- "Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land? Whiles it remained, did it not remain thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thy power? How is it that thou hast conceived this thing in thy heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." (V. 3,4.).

Now the first point to be emphasised is that there is no mention of Satan in the actual narrative. Satan is found only in the words of Peter: it is rather a rhetorical than a literary expression. What Peter is evidently desiring to express is that he thinks that

Ananias has yielded to temptation. But from the time of the Book of Job, temptation or testing has ever been associated with the figure of Satan. Again, in that vast corpus of literature which emanated from the Apocalyptic Movement, we find that the name Satan is used to express the idea of supreme evil personified, something or somebody altogether hostile towards both God and man. In the New Testament, however, we have seen several examples which have led us to suspect strongly that the word Satan can be used in both of these senses. Now we must strive to determine in which sense the word is to be taken in this instance under examination. Have we here the tester or tempter of Job; or is this the altogether evil Satan of contemporary Judaism?

At first sight, it would seem as though the word was used in the latter evil sense. Our English Versions give a rendering which suggests this:- "Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, etc." Here we seem in the words 'to lie' to have an evil nature depicted somewhat akin to that of the Devil in the Fourth Gospel:- "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and stood not in the

truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father thereof." (John, VIII.44.). We also know that the serpent of Genesis III. was regarded as being a liar. In the Pseudepigraphical and other Jewish literature this serpent was equated with Satan, a Satan who was supremely evil.

But can we feel certain that the translation 'to lie' is entirely correct? Those responsible for the Revised Version manifestly felt some hesitation on this point, for in their Margin they suggest 'to deceive' as an alternative rendering. The word employed in the original Greek - ψεύσασθαι - means rather 'to cheat' than 'to lie.' Here it is found with the accusative, a construction nowhere else to seen in the New Testament; in Classical Greek it means either 'to tell lies about a person' or 'to deceive somebody.' The former rendering is obviously impossible in the present context. We are therefore led to conclude that the correct translation is 'to deceive the Holy Ghost.' In this way we see that the direct connection with lying - and the passage from the Fourth Gospel - is far more apparent than real.

It must be noted that Luke used a similar expression of the offence of Judas. He too yielded to temptation; with him too the temptation took the form of the greed of gain.

The second occurrence of the word Satan is in Paul's defence of himself before Agrippa. Telling of the incident on the Damascus road, he speaks of the voice which said to him:- "Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom I send thee, to open their eyes, that they may turn from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive remission of sins and an inheritance among them that are sanctified ~~in~~ by faith in me." (XXVI. 17-18.). It is no hard matter to determine the force of the word Satan in this context. No simple Old Testament conception underlies its use here: rather have we here that slight touch of dualism which is reminiscent of apocalyptic teaching. Satan is not the servant of God, fulfilling his purposes: he is something opposed to God, just as the darkness is opposed to the light. Paul was to carry on that function of the Messiah which was to defeat Satan. He was to help men to abandon

the realm of sin and death for that of holiness and life. In studying this passage, two considerations are of vital importance. Firstly, the manner in which darkness is contrasted with light. Secondly, the fact that in contemporary thought Satan was identified with the Angel of Death.

In the course of our investigations we have frequently noted how that the references to Satan are introduced at a later date: that it is when the incident is narrated a second time that the figure of the Evil One makes its appearance. Let us examine the narrative of the conversion of Paul as given in Acts IX. He hears a voice speaking to him:- "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: but rise, and enter into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do."

Here no mention is made of the sway of Satan: no contrast is drawn between the opposing forces of light and darkness. The same phenomenon is to be observed in Paul's defence to the people of the Jews, as narrated in Acts XXII. Again the story of the conversion is told, and again there is no mention of Satan.

An interesting use of the word *διαβολος* occurs in Peter's address before Cornelius. "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him." (X. 38.). As early as the time of the Book of Job the conception existed that physical suffering could be inflicted by God, the Satan acting as his agent. This, of course, was a crude attempt at a solution of the problem of suffering, firmly based on monism, which regarded physical suffering as being a disciplinary process, and of divine origin.

But here a different and more apocalyptic conception seems to be indicated. Bodily sickness is regarded as belonging to that kingdom of evil which is ruled over by the Devil, an idea which was plainly revealed in the apocalypses, more especially in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch and the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch. It is worth noting that this conception appears but rarely in the Gospels, apart from one passage of Luke ---- the reference to the diseased woman "whom Satan had bound, lo, these eighteen years." (XIII. 16.). It is not necessary to regard the reference in Acts as being directed towards only that side of our Lord's healing miracles

which resulted in the casting-out of demons. Rather should we understand this as being a current idiomatic manner of speaking of all types of physical suffering.

The remaining instance of the word διάβολος occurs in the passing rebuke which Elymas the sorcerer receives from Paul. "But Saul, who is also called Paul, filled with the Holy Ghost, fastened his eyes on him, and said, O full of all guile and all villainy, thou son of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" (XIII.10.). In the first place it must be observed, in investigating this expression 'son of the devil', that amongst Semitic-speaking peoples the word 'son' is used in a very wide sense, indicating general connection. The Old Testament furnishes many examples of this usage, such as 'sons of the prophets,' or 'sons of Belial.'

It is not, however, so easy to see what is the exact meaning of the word διάβολος in this context. It might indicate, as it does in the LXX, 'enemy' ---- the entire expression meaning 'you son of a foe.' This balances well with the clause which follows --- 'enemy of all righteousness' --- although an abstract noun would have been more fitting --- 'son of hostility.'

Perhaps the better interpretation is to regard the

word as meaning Satan. In verse 6 we were told that the sorcerer was a Jew, and that his name was Bar-Jesus. Can it be that Paul is playing upon this name, substituting "son of the devil" for "son of Jesus"? This could explain the very rare omission of the definite article: *διαβολος* has, for the sake of the play upon words, been for the moment regarded as being almost a proper name. The word seems to possess its full apocalyptic force, indicating something entirely evil.

The expression 'first-born of Satan' was not unknown in both Jewish and Christian writings. Thus in the Talmud we meet with the following:- "I have a younger brother who is a dare-devil (lit: firstborn of Satan), and his name is Jonathan and he is one of the disciples of Shammai." (Tebamoth, 16a ---- Soncino Translation). Ignatius, uttering a warning against the errors of the Docetae, says:- "Do ye also avoid these wicked offshoots of Satan, Simon his firstborn son, and Menander, and Basilides, etc." (To the Tralians, XI.). Of a similar nature are some words of Polycarp:- "Whosoever does not confess the testimony of the cross, is of the devil; and whosoever perverts the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts, and says

that there is neither a resurrection nor a judgment, he is the firstborn of Satan." (Ep. chap. VII.).

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

Characteristic of this epistle is the absence of the word Σατανᾶς , although διάβολος is found on two occasions. The first example seems to reflect a conception similar to that of the Book of Job, viz: the spirit of temptation:-

"Lay aside falsehood, then, let each tell his neighbour the truth, for we are members one of another. Be angry but do not sin; never let the sun set upon your exasperation, give the devil no chance. Let the thief steal no more." (IV. 25,26... following Moffatt's rendering.). Most scholars, including Westcott, interpret this passage along the following lines. Anger must be checked, because the man who allows himself to become the victim of his rage renders himself an easy prey for the tempter.

It is possible to adopt a different interpretation: to take διάβολος in its LXX sense of 'enemy.' As is well known, to lose the temper often means losing the game. The man who gives way to his passion provides his enemy with a great opportunity. Luther, however, obviously took the word in its full Classical sense of

'slanderer' --- "Gebet auch nicht Raum dem Lästterer"

--- 'Don't provide an opportunity for the one who slanders you.' Erasmus and others have adopted a similar rendering: the Syriac may mean either 'the Devil' or 'the slanderer' (ܐܠܗܐ ܕܠܥܝܪܐ).

The second passage is as follows:- "Be strong in the Lord and in the strength of his might; put on God's armour so as to be able to stand against the strategems of the devil. For we have to struggle, not with blood and flesh but with the Angelic Rulers, the angelic authorities, the potentates of the dark present, the spirit forces of evil in the heavenly sphere." (VI. 10-12... following Moffatt's rendering). Here the context renders it evident that we are dealing with no earthly and human foe: the reference must be to a foe who is heavenly and superhuman. The figure of the Devil is in this passage something culled from the apocalypses, rather than from the Old Testament. There is a definite suggestion that the Devil is opposed to God; that he is most certainly one whose actions are not divinely guided.

It is worthy of note that the writer mentions among those against whom there is to be the struggle 'the potentates of the dark present (πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ

σκοτεινός τούτου). This word κοσμοκράτωρ does not again occur in the New Testament: but Irenaeus says that it was a title of the Devil used by the Valentinians (Against Heresies, Bk. I. V. 4).

The apocalyptic attitude towards the Devil is again manifested in this epistle when the writer speaks of him as 'the prince of the power of the air.' "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." (II. 1,2.). The expression ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ αἵρος looks back to that conception which regarded the atmosphere as being the peculiar domain of the Devil and the evil spirits.

The apocalypses provide many parallels. Thus, in the Testament of Benjamin, we find the words:- "For he that feareth God and loveth his neighbour cannot be smitten by the spirit of the air of Beliar." (III. 4.). A similar conception appears in the Slavonic Book of Enoch. Here we read of the fall of Satan and his angels: how the air became their domain:- "And I threw him out from the height with his angels, and he was flying in the air continuously above the bottomless." (XXIV. 5.).

We may also compare with this two passages from the Ascension of Isaiah:-

(a). "And we ascended to the firmament, I and he, and there I saw Sammael and his hosts." (VII. 9.).

(b). "And again he descended into the firmament where dwelleth the ruler of this world." (X. 29.).

The fullest expression of this belief is to found in the "De Incarnatione" of Athanasius --- already quoted in full on pages 154 and 155 of this thesis.

It seems to be highly probable that the writer uses the expression ὁ πονηρὸς of the Devil. "Hold your ground, tighten the belt of truth about your loins, wear integrity as your coat of mail, and have your feet shod with the stability of the gospel of peace; above all, take faith as your shield, to enable you to quench all the fire-tipped darts flung by the evil one, put on salvation as your helmet." (VI. 14-16... following Moffatt's rendering.). This seems to be the most likely rendering, although it is possible to regard τοῦ πονηροῦ as being neuter, translating by 'the weapons of evil.' In favour of this it must be confessed that such a rendering would give an excellent parallel with the preceding expressions--- τὸν θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσύνης and τὸν θυρεὸν τῆς πίστεως. In this way all the genitives would indicate that which

constitutes the breastplate, the shield, and the darts. The Authorised Version does not commit itself, giving the rendering 'all the fiery darts of the wicked.'⁸ On the other hand, the Revised Version reads 'all the fiery darts of the evil one.'⁸ The Vulgate rendering is not devoid of interest, reading, as it does, 'nequissimi'; whereas in those passages where it is generally held that the Evil One is indicated the Latin normally has either 'malus' or 'malignus' (Matthew, XIII.19; John, XVII.15; I. John, II. 13; III. 12; V. 18.).

If, however, the more common interpretation of this passage is accepted, then it cannot be denied that here there is some sort of dualism implied, partaking of the apocalyptic in its character. It is not an absolute form of dualism, for if the Christian has been previously equipped with the protective armour of righteousness and faith, he is able to withstand these fiery darts.

In conclusion, we may note the significant fact that neither ὁ διάβολος nor ὁ πονηρὸς is used of the Devil in those epistles which are universally regarded as being of Pauline authorship.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE BOOK OF REVELATION

It is not surprising, in view of its highly apocalyptic character, to find that this writing contains many references to the personification of supreme evil. In spite of its comparative brevity, it mentions the Devil and Satan no less than 13 times by these names, a figure which appears most significant when contrasted with the four references which are found in the Acts, or the eight in the entire Pauline epistles.

Of these thirteen examples, eight contain the word Satan, and five the Devil. The writer draws little, if any, distinction between the two: and twice he places the terms in apposition to one another, on both occasions identifying with them the serpent of the Fall-story of Genesis III. The examples are as follows:-

(a). XII. 9. "And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him."

(b). XX. 2. "And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years."

But a cursory glance at these two passages is sufficient to show us that here we have none of the simple Old Testament attitude towards Satan. On the other

hand, these are the conceptions with which we have become familiar in our examination of the Jewish apocalypses. Satan is no longer the servant of God: now he is a foe. He is identified with the serpent, an identification which we have already noted in the Slavonic Book of Enoch and in other writings. Through his deception of our first parents, through his hostility - not only towards God, but also towards man - he is regarded as 'deceiving the whole world.' Here we have a reference to his angels. And there is also that other conception, one of the greatest characteristics of the apocalypses, that Satan's power is of a transitory nature: it must come to an end.

The end of Satan is mentioned elsewhere in this writing, as in the following passage:- "And the Devil, that deceived them, was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever." (XX. 10.). It is not necessary for us to give here the parallels to this which exist in the apocalypses; full examination has been made of them in the course of our study of the Ethiopic Enoch. Attention may, however, be drawn to the fact that Death and

Satan, so often associated with one another, will in the end meet with the same fate:- "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire." (XX. 14.). It was into this 'lake of fire' that Satan was to be cast.

Further examples are to be observed of the manner in which the writer throws God and the Devil into opposition. Thus, in the letter to the Church of Smyrna, the Jews are designated as being the 'Synagogue of Satan.' "I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich), and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the Synagogue of Satan." (II. 9.). For many centuries the Jews had claimed to be a Synagogue of the Lord (שְׁנֵי הַקְּהִלִּים יהוה, Numbers XVI. 3; XX. 4; מִדְּבַר יְהוָה Numbers XXXI. 16.). But now, in view of their conduct, the writer asserts that the reverse holds good: they belong, not to the Synagogue of God, but to that of Satan, his direct antithesis.

Almost identical in thought is a passage in the letter to the Church of Philadelphia:- "Behold, I will make them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie; behold, I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee." (III. 9.).

In the letter to the Church of Smyrna we meet with an interesting reference to the Devil:- "Fear none of these things which thou shalt suffer: behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days: be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." (II. 10.). Here the allusion is to persecution, an experience which, in spite of its distressing details, is regarded as serving a useful disciplinary purpose. This purpose is that the Christians may be tested, just as in the past Job was tested. They must endure, even though this testing results in their death. The verse which follows stresses their ultimate reward:- "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches; He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death." (II. 11.).

This idea of the Devil being the agent in persecution is no novel conception. Already we have seen it dimly emerging in the Pauline epistles; in full detail in I. Peter:- "Your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour."

Yet at the same time we must ever remember that the most ardent persecutions of the Early Christians came from Rome and its Emperors. It would be no difficult

transition for the primitive mind, seeing the Emperor as the agent of this persecution, to come to regard the Emperor as being the earthly tabernacle of the Devil. In connection with this it is well worth our while to turn to the letter to the Church in Pergamum. This city was the greatest centre of Emperor worship in the East; in it were the Temples and shrines of the imperial cultus. But in the Book of Revelation (II. 13.) we find the following epithets applied to this city ----- 'where is the throne of Satan', and 'where Satan dwells.' This aspect of the subject we propose to deal with fully in our section on the Incarnation of Satan: at the moment we shall merely point to the significant fact that Nero was mentioned, so the majority of Scholars agree, as Beliar in the Sibylline Books.

Following the reference to the casting-out of Satan, we meet with these words:- "Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night." (XII. 10.). This would appear to be based on the conceptions of the Parables of Enoch, where we find that one of the functions of the Satans was that of

accusing men before God:- "I heard the fourth voice fending off the Satans and forbidding them to come before the Lord of Spirits to accuse them who dwell on the earth." (Ethiopic Enoch, XL. 7.).

THE NERONIC MYTH.

Does the expression 'the Beast' in the Book of Revelation allude to Satan? This question is bound to arise: and we are compelled to give a negative answer, feeling convinced that here we have merely a reference to the Nero Redivivus Myth.

When Nero committed suicide, although the majority of the people rejoiced, there were some who refused to believe that he was really dead. For evidence of this we may consult Tacitus:- "Vario super exitu ejus rumore eoque pluribus vivere eum fingentibus credentibusque." (Hist. II. 8.). According to Suetonius, edicts continued to be issued in the name of Nero as though he were still alive. Within a year of his death an impostor appeared under the name of Nero and was duly put to death.

Soon the myth began to assume the form that Nero would return from the East, doubtlessly due to certain prophecies made in the past that he would found a world-empire from Jerusalem (vide Suetonius, 'Nero' 40).

A second impostor appeared in the East about 80 A.D., and eight years later yet a third impostor arose amongst the Parthians (vide Tacitus, Hist: I. 2.).

In time the eschatology of Judaism came to adopt this Nero Redivivus Myth. Thus it is to be observed underlying various passages in the Sibylline Oracles (Bk V.). Here Nero is described as being a fugitive to Parthia who would later return to the West at the head of huge armies.

Even in the New Testament traces of the Myth may be clearly seen. There is a reference to the Eastern kings in Revelation, XVI. 12:- "And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared."

In Revelation XVII there are manifest indications that we are here reading of the belief in Nero's returning at the head of the Parthian kings. "The beast that thou sawest was, and is not; and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition -----when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and yet is." (verse 8.). "And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space. And

the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seventh, and goeth into perdition. ---- These have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the beast." (verses 10 -13.).

It is not difficult after examining these passages to reach the conclusion that the Beast here is not Satan, but that reincarnation of Nero which was expected to make its appearance in the near future. That this Beast was thought to be inspired by Satan is highly probable: but any complete identification is excluded by a reference in Chapter XX:- "And the devil, that deceived them, was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever." (verse 10). From this it is clear that the writer regarded Satan and the Beast as being separate and distinct entities.

SATAN AND THE DRAGON.

Towards the beginning of this chapter, mention was made of the fact that on two different occasions the writer of Revelation identified Satan with the serpent. What is equally arresting is that in both instances he also identifies Satan with the Dragon. The latter, it seems highly probable, comes originally from the

Babylonian myth of the birth of Marduk the sun-god (vide H. Gunkel, "Schöpfung und Chaos"). From what little data we possess, it appears likely that the Hebrews had formed contacts with Babylon from very early times, assimilating some of the mythological ideas of that country. For many years scholars have noted the close resemblance which the Creation-stories of Genesis bear to those of Babylon. The picturesque nature of the Dragon-myth would render it attractive to the imagination of simple folk, and it may well be that this myth had continued to survive throughout the ages. It has many aspects: the deep is bound up with it, also the Hebrews' dread of the sea.

It is not difficult to picture how such a myth would appeal to the apocalyptic imagination of the writer of the Book of Revelation, for whom one of the most delightful details of the Future World was that there would be 'no more sea.'

At the same time, while considering this interpretation of the Dragon-references, it must ever be remembered that some earthly power or person may here be spoken of in a symbolical manner. Even as early as the Psalms of Solomon we find that Pompey was

mentioned as 'the dragon.'

CHAPTER XV.

SATAN AND THE SERPENT.

Towards the end of June, 1909, Pope Pius X., who had previously bound his priests to an anti-modernist oath, demanded that the literal interpretation of Genesis I-III should be accepted. Furthermore, he commanded that the following points should not be called in question:-

"Everything that touches on the facts which bear on the foundation of the Christian religion, such as the creation of all things made by God in the beginning of time; the formation of the first woman from the rib of man; the unity of the human race; the original bliss of our forefathers in a state of justice, integrity, and immortality; God's command to man in order to try his obedience; the transgression of the divine order at the instigation of the devil disguised as a serpent; the fall of our first parents from that primitive state of innocence; the promise of a future Redeemer." (Albert Houtin, 'A Short History of Christianity', Paris, 1924, pages 98 - 99.).

Such is the official belief of the Church of Rome, a belief which is also firmly upheld by many Protestants. And it is a very natural belief for any man to hold; for, due to some innate tendency, man is rarely so inventive as when discovering the Devil where no Devil is. But neither the Protestant nor the Roman Catholic can feel too happy when asked to document this belief; for the serpent and Satan are not identified in any passage of the Old Testament. Nor are they even so much as associated with one another.

Most certainly Genesis III. fails to support any such theory. There it is the serpent that suggests to the woman that she should eat of the fruit of the tree. And this serpent was merely one of the beasts of the field which God had made. True, it was more cunning than the rest: but it was not evil. "And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good."

Why, it may well be asked, was the serpent of all beasts singled out to fulfil the graceless office of seducing our first parents? It would almost seem as though the writers of this portion of the Pentateuch

had some special animus against the serpent. May not this partake of the nature of an aetiological myth, a story written with the express object of bringing the serpent into disrepute? It will repay us if we examine the earlier narratives of the Pentateuch and kindred historical writings with a view to the discovering of some clue.

In the XXIst chapter of Numbers we read that the Israelites became dissatisfied with the manna; they longed for a change of diet, and began to murmur. To punish them "the Lord sent fiery serpents among the people, and they bit the people, and much people of Israel died." In time they repented: and Moses, acting upon the Lord's instructions, made a fiery serpent of brass, "and put it upon a pole; and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived."

Turning to the Second Book of Kings we read of the reign of Hezekiah, and of his efforts to purify the cultus. "He removed the high places, and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made: for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and he called it Nehushtan." (II. Kings XVIII. 4.). Here at last we have discovered what we

need: here we have full evidence that some form of serpent-worship had its vogue. What is more interesting is that until the time of Hezekiah nobody had ever thought of forbidding it. In other words, it was regarded as being a very proper course of conduct.

Now our theory is as follows. From early times, borrowed from we know not where, but most probably from Egypt, the Israelites had been in the habit of indulging in serpent worship. To justify such worship there had arisen the popular legend which associated it with those years of trial and deliverance in the wilderness. Better still, it was intimately associated with their greatest figure, Moses. Hence it is that we read the story of Moses and the brazen serpent in the Book of Numbers.

But then there came a time when certain reformers would have none of this serpent-worship. The serpent had to be relegated into a position of disrepute. And to effect this object the serpent was introduced into the Fall-story; the climax of which is that the serpent was cursed by Jehovah God. Whether this serpent of the Fall-story was invented, or whether it was borrowed from the mythology of some other nation, is a question which can never be settled. Attempts have been made to associate it with the Babylonian Tiamat;

but influences from this quarter are more likely to appear in post-exilic writings, a better parallel being found in the Tehom of Genesis I. It is not likely that Babylonian ideas would greatly affect Israelitish religious belief before the Exile. As may be gathered from the Books of Kings, most of the people were ignorant of Aramaic as late as the reign of Hezekiah:- "Speak, I pray thee, to thy servants in the Syrian language; for we understand it; and talk not with us in the Jews' language in the ears of the people that are on the wall.(XVIII. 26.).

In many other details of the Fall-story scholars have seen traces of foreign influences. Dr. Guillaume endorses this opinion in the following words:- "It is a legend which has been borrowed from an alien people: it was not evolved - like the eternal truths uttered by the Hebrew prophets - from men's consciousness of communion with the God of the spirits of all flesh. A desire to explain things, rather than a desire to know the truth, accounts for the aetiological explanation of the pangs of childbirth and the growth of noxious weeds." (Prophecy and Divination, page 237.).

Passing on to our study of the identification of Satan with the serpent we may say that nothing which even hints at this may be found in the Old Testament.

The same verdict may be passed upon the Apocrypha, apart from a single verse of the Wisdom of Solomon:- "By envy of the devil, death entered into the world" (II. 24.). Some scholars have suggested that this is a reference to the serpent: others that the murder of Abel is indicated. In our section on the Apocrypha we have gone so far as to suggest that the word *διαβολος* may here with some justification be taken as referring to an earthly adversary.

In some of the Apocalyptic and Pseudepigraphical writings we find that the two were identified. A complete identification is to be seen in the Slavonic Book of Enoch, and in the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch. Again, the serpent is identified with one of the Satans - Gadreel - in the Parables of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch. Satan inspired the serpent according to the lost Assumption of Moses. But no such association is to be found in the Book of Jubilees, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Psalms of Solomon, the Fragments of the Zadokite Work, the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch. From these facts we can safely conclude that this legend was not accepted universally at this time.

The New Testament contributes but little towards the establishment of the legend. Eve is mentioned

in one passage only: here, it is true, the figure of the serpent is introduced, but there is no hint of Satan. (See our comments on II. Corinthians XI. 2-3, in the section on the Pauline epistles.) The Synoptic Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles contain nothing which even suggests an acceptance of this legend. The Fourth Gospel (chap. VIII) may reflect some slight knowledge of it. But it is perhaps significant that the Book of Revelation, the most apocalyptic of the New Testament writings, provides us with the only definite identification of the serpent and Satan. Here, most certainly, on two different occasions (XII. 9; XX. 2) we find Satan and the Devil identified with something called ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, which is also the Dragon. This old serpent is generally identified with the serpent of Genesis, although some have preferred to see in it a reference to the Dragon-myth.

In other writings we meet with varying conceptions. Thus, in the Revelation of Moses we find that the two are not identified, the suggestion being made that the Devil played upon the serpent's pride. The serpent then became the Devil's instrument, and it was through the serpent's mouth that he spake. In the same writing we meet with a new detail: the Devil puts on

the fruit "the poison of his wickedness, that is, of his desire ---- for desire is the head of all sin."

Josephus does not identify the two. He does, however, supply the interesting detail that God deprived the serpent of its power of speech, at the same time taking away its feet (vide Antiquities, Bk. I. I. 4.). The motive of the serpent is stated to have been envy: Satan is said to have had a similar motive in the Slavonic Book of Enoch (XXXI.)

Ignatius, on the other hand, does not hesitate to equate the serpent with Satan. "Let no one be anointed with the bad odour of the doctrine of the prince of this world; let not the holy church of God be led captive by his subtlety, as was the first woman." (To the Ephesians, XVII.). "Do ye therefore flee from these ungodly heresies; for they are the inventions of the devil, that serpent who was the author of evil, and who by means of the woman deceived Adam, the father of our race." (To the Trallians, X.).

From time to time it has been suggested that the name Eve (חַוָּה) really means a serpent. This is found in Jewish literature, for the Midrash (Ber. Rab. par. 21 on Gen. III. 20) compares the name with the Aramaic חַוָּה, explaining the phenomenon as follows:- "She

was given to Adam to glorify his life, but she counselled him like a serpent." This thought is manifested in the writings of some of the Fathers, who also associate the word with the cry εὐὸι , evoe, heard at the Bacchanalia. The following passage from Clement of Alexandria is worthy of consideration. "The bacchanals hold their orgies in honour of the frenzied Dionysus ---- crowned with snakes, shrieking out the name of that Eva by whom error came into the world. The symbol of the Bacchic orgies is a consecrated serpent. Moreover, according to the strict interpretation of the Hebrew term, the name Hevia, aspirated, signifies a female serpent." (Exhortation to the Heathen, II.).

A similar thought finds expression in the writings of Theophilus:- "This Eve, on account of her having been in the beginning deceived by the serpent, and become the author of sin, the wicked demon, who is also called Satan, who then spoke to her through the serpent, and who works even to this day in those men that are possessed by him, invokes as Eve. And he is called 'demon' and 'dragon' on account of his (ἀποδιδρακίνας) revolting from God. For at first he was an angel." (Ad Autol: Book II. chap. XXVIII.).

Methodius identifies the two, at the same time showing that the Devil's evil work did not cease with the mere seduction of the woman. He it was who induced them to make the aprons of fig-leaves:- "The devil, having beguiled the man by its imitations, led him captive, persuading him to conceal the nakedness of his body by fig-leaves; that is by their friction he excited him to sexual pleasure." (The Banquet of the Ten Virgins, Discourse X. chap. V.). The Jews were of the opinion that the aprons or girdles with which God provided Adam and Eve were made of serpent's skin (vide Pirke R. El. XX.).

In order that it may be understood how readily the Church accepted the belief that Satan and the serpent were identical, we propose to conclude this section with a series of extracts from the Fathers.

Justin Martyr. "For among us the prince of the wicked spirits is called the serpent, and Satan, and the devil; as you can learn by looking into our writings." (First Apology, XXVIII.).

Clementine Homilies. "Before all things, therefore, you ought to consider the evil-working suggestion of the deceiving serpent that is in you, etc." (X).

Recognitions of Clement. "Above all, therefore, you ought to understand the deception of the old serpent and

his cunning suggestions, who deceives you as it were by prudence." (Book V. chap. XVII.).

Pseudo-Ignatius. "Thou, O Belial, dragon, crooked serpent, rebel against God, outcast from Christ, alien from the Holy Spirit, exile from the ranks of angels, reviler of the laws of God, enemy of all that is lawful, who didst rise up against the first-formed of men, etc." (To the Philip:).

Gregory Thaumaturgus. "Shall this word 'Hail' prove the cause of trouble to me, as of old the fair promise of being made like God, which was given her by the serpent-devil, proved to our first mother Eve?" (Homily 'On the Annunciation').

Clement of Alexandria. "Therefore (for the seducer is one and the same) he that at the beginning brought Eve down to death, now brings thither the rest of mankind." (Exhortation to the Heathen I.).

(NOTE. Elsewhere Clement adopts an allegorical interpretation of this incident, somewhat akin to that of Philo (De Op. Mund. and Allegor. Interp.):-- "The first man, when in Paradise, sported free, because he was the child of God; but when he succumbed to pleasure (for the serpent allegorically signifies pleasure crawling on its belly, earthly wickedness nourished for fuel to the flames) was a child

seduced by lust." (Exhortation to the Heathen, X.).

Origen. "Observing that in the writings of Moses --- mention is made of this wicked one, and of his having fallen from heaven. For the serpent --- having become the cause of man's expulsion from the divine Paradise, obscurely shadows forth something similar, having deceived the woman by a promise of divinity and of greater blessings; and her example is said to have been followed also by the man."

(Against Celsus, Book VI. chap. XLIII.).

Jerome. "What snares, think you, is the devil now weaving? ---- Perchance, mindful of his old trick, he will try to tempt Bonosus with hunger." (Letter III.)

Gregory of Nyssa. "And he, that evil charmer, framing his new device of sin against our race, drew along his serpent train, a disguise worthy of his own intent, entering in his impunity into what was like himself --- dwelling, earthly and mundane as he was in will, in that creeping thing." (On the Baptism of Christ.).

CHAPTER XVI.

THE INCARNATION OF SATAN

We to-day are hardly inclined to accept, in any

literal sense, Tertullian's well-known dictum that Satan is the ape of God. But at the same time our researches have been deep enough to show us that men came to postulate of their Devil much that they were accustomed to postulate of their God. It was this tendency which was responsible for Satan being given his hosts of evil angels.

It is not our purpose to trace the evolution of the Messianic hope. Suffice it to say that there evolved in Judaism a belief that there would come One who was both human and divine: One who, after the manner of some earthly prince, would help the Jews to recover their shattered fortunes, to establish some earthly kingdom of surpassing grandeur. And just as their material surroundings grew less attractive, so did their belief in this Messiah-prince become all the more convinced.

There are various indications that there was also growing a belief that not only God, but also Satan, could assume an earthly body and dwell as man among men. And he, being the incarnation of all that was evil, would naturally be one to do much harm to the Jewish nation. It is not surprising, then, to find that certain earthly oppressors should have come to

be regarded as the incarnations of Satan.

This tendency may be observed in some of the apocalypses. Thus, if we turn to the Psalms of Solomon, we find that Pompey is spoken of both as 'the lawless one' and 'the dragon.' In the Sibylline Books the name Beliar, normally reserved for Satan, is used of some earthly individual. And there seems to be but little doubt that ^{this} individual is Nero.

Similar to this is the teaching contained in the Ascension of Isaiah. "Beliar the great ruler, the king of this world, will descend, who hath ruled it since it came into being; yea, he will descend from his firmament in the likeness of a man, a lawless king, the slayer of his mother: who himself (even) this king will persecute the plant which the Twelve Apostles of the Beloved have planted. Of the Twelve one will be delivered into his hands. This ruler in the form of that king will come, and there will come with him all the powers of this world, and they will hearken unto him in all that he desires. -----They will sacrifice to him and they will serve him, saying: 'This is God and beside him there is no other.'" (IV. 2 - 8.). This quotation speaks for itself. Beliar,

we know, is but another name for Satan. He will be incarnated, coming "in the likeness of a man." And we need feel no trepidation in identifying this man with Nero, the instigator of the first Roman persecution, in which Peter - "one of the Twelve" - was popularly supposed to have perished.

The Book of Revelation seems to provide evidence which is akin to this. In the letter to the Church of Pergamum we read:} "I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat is: and thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith, even in those days wherein Antipas was my faithful martyr, who was slain among you, where Satan dwelleth." (Revelation, II. 13.). The meaning of the expressions 'where Satan's seat is' and 'where Satan dwelleth' becomes perfectly clear when we recollect that Pergamum was the most important centre of the Emperor cultus in the East. Here a Temple had been dedicated to Augustus in 29 B.C. Later, temples were built in honour of both Trajan and Severus. This, it should be added, is the interpretation of these words which is most generally accepted: although there have been made attempts at associating here Satan with Zeus Soter, an altar to whom had been erected some 800 feet above Pergamum. Some scholars have suggested

that this refers to the worship of Asclepius, who was associated with the serpent --- in its turn associated by the writer with Satan. Against these two suggestions we may say that it has long been recognised that there are references to a Roman Emperor, probably Nero, in chapters XVI and XVII of the Book of Revelation.

The Christians came to take up a new attitude towards the Messiah. Jesus, they knew, was the Christ: but he had been no earthly prince, leading his followers to some glorious earthly kingdom. He had moved among men as an ordinary man, doing good and proclaiming the glad tidings of the Kingdom --- no external material kingdom, but a Kingdom of God which was within his followers.

But as their ideas of the Messiah underwent great modifications, so did their ideas regarding the incarnation of Satan. He need not be always an earthly persecuting king: he could also be regarded as indwelling in any mortal who seemed opposed to the Christian faith, who strove to pervert the tenets of orthodox doctrine. The old terms, the old expressions, were still employed: but they were given a new connotation. As an example of this we may

turn to II. Corinthians:- "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" (VI. 14,15).

Here, in this use of the term Belial, we may note some interesting transitions. In the Old Testament it never appeared as a proper name: it was merely an abstract noun, meaning 'worthlessness.' In the apocalypses it was regularly employed as a name for Satan. By the time of the Sibylline Books it could denote a human ruler --- e.g. Nero --- Whose actions appeared to be dictated by Satan. The last stage of all is when the conception of the earthly ruler sinks out of sight, ideas of Antichrist being substituted. And this, we suggest, is the conception underlying the passage from II. Corinthians which we have quoted above.

A further fusion of these conceptions is to be observed in II. Thessalonians. Here we have a reference to 'the man of lawlessness', an expression which seems to be the equivalent of Belial --- for the LXX represents this term by ἀνομία in Deuteronomy XV. 9, and by ἀνομία in II. Kingdoms XXII. 5, while παράνομος is

is often used as its equivalent. Yet this 'Belial' is also an earthly Antichrist:- "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." (II. Thessalonians II. 4.). "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming. Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all ~~signs~~ power and signs and lying wonders." (verses 8 and 9.).

Here, then, we have depicted an Antichrist who is a God-opposing man armed with miraculous or Satanic powers. One important detail should be noted: the signification of all this seems to be far more religious than political.

From our study of the Johannine epistles we have seen that the Antichrist here appears to be a teacher of false doctrines, somewhat akin to the 'false prophet' of the Book of Revelation. And here we may add that in the writings of the Fathers it is quite common to find heresy and heretics intimately associated with Satan. It is in the light of this that the letter to the Church at Thyatira should be studied:- "But unto you I say, and unto the rest in Thyatira, as many as

have not this doctrine, and which have not known the depths (βάθος) of Satan, as they speak: I will put upon you none other burden." (Revelation II.24.). Some scholars have gone so far as to suggest that these words represent the actual claim of the Gnostic element in the Church of Thyatira, (vide Charles, I.C.C. in loc.).

Now we may direct our attention to the manner in which the Fathers came to interpret the references to the Antichrist. Jerome, writing on Daniel VII. 8, says:- "Nor let us think that he (Antichrist) ----- is the devil or a demon, but one of men in whom Satan is wholly to dwell bodily." In a similar way Chrysostom (Homily 2) seeks to explain II. Thessalonians II:- "But who is this one? Think you, Satan? By no means, but some man possessed of all his energy." Akin to this are the words of Irenaeus (V. 25. 1.):- "Receiving all the virtue of the devil,---- summing up within himself the apostacy of the devil." As a result of this teaching of Jerome and Chrysostom the belief that Antichrist was the Devil himself largely vanished from men's minds.

The opinions of Hippolytus in his Treatise on Christ and the Antichrist are worthy of quotation:-

"The Saviour appeared in the form of man, and he (Anti-christ) too will come in the form of a man." (chap.VI.). Also Ambrosiaster on II. Thessalonians II. 3:- "As the Son of God in his human life manifests his divine nature, so also shall Satan appear in human form."

Further indications of this belief that Satan could assume a weighty body are to be seen in the apocalypses. Thus, the identification of Satan with the serpent of Genesis III. presupposes this conception --- for Satan was thought to have entered into the serpent. Again, in the Slavonic Life of Adam and Eve, we read that the latter experienced a second temptation after the Fall. "The devil came, wearing the form of an angel. ---- But I perceived that he was the devil and answered him nothing. But Adam, when he returned from Jordan, saw the devil's footprints, and feared lest perchance he had deceived me." (XXXVIII - XXXIX.). It need hardly be added that no body can leave a footprint unless it is possessed of weight.

It is not our purpose to trace these incarnation ideas with any detail. In the course of the centuries they were developed to an absurd degree. Even still it is possible for the tourist to be shown the Devil's footprints on a stone which once formed part of St. Pan-

cras' Church, Canterbury. But Satan is the 'ape of God': and this same tourist, should he chance to visit Rome, may still be shown One Other's footsteps on the Appian Way.

By the XVth and XVIth centuries these conceptions of the incarnate Satan had reached their foul zenith. Of the horrible details of this aspect of our study, and more especially regarding those countless confessions of engaging in sexual intercourse with Satan, we crave permission to maintain silence. Such a tragedy of errors is better to be forgotten.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE NAME LUCIFER.

No better illustration of the manner in which the Satan-concept was evolved can be given than a brief history of the word Lucifer, the favourite name for the Devil in the Middle Ages.

In Scripture this word is met with on a single occasion only: not in the Hebrew or the LXX, but merely in the Latin (Old Lat. and Vulgate.). The XIIIth. and XIVth. chapters of Isaiah consist largely of a series of oracles against the king of Babylon.

In XIV. 12. we meet with the words:- ~~לְכָל־בְּרִיָּה~~ ~~וְלִפְנֵי־יְהוָה~~

~~וְלִפְנֵי־יְהוָה~~ ~~וְלִפְנֵי־יְהוָה~~, which may best be translated:- "How art thou fallen from heaven, O brightly shining one, son of the morning." Here the word

לְכָל־בְּרִיָּה, derived from the root לָכַח, seems to indicate the morning-star, the allusion being to the fading of the morning-star's brilliance when the daylight appears.

The LXX rendering of the Hebrew is most felicitous, there being employed the word ἑωσφορος, "bringer of morn" or "morning-star." The Vulgate gives an exact translation of the LXX, Lucifer; a word which may be used either as an adjective --- 'light-bearing' --- or as a noun --- 'morning-star' or the planet Venus.

Thus far there has been no suggestion of there being any implication of evil underlying the words לְכָל־בְּרִיָּה, ἑωσφορος, and Lucifer. The last, on the contrary, was implicit of virtue rather than of vice, being a complimentary epithet bestowed on various figures of Latin mythology. It could also be employed as a name for human beings, as, for example, in the instance of Lucifer, the Bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia.

As we have already seen, much was made of the

fall of the Watchers in the apocalypses. In the Ethiopic Book of Enoch one of the foremost of these Watchers was called Azazel, and on certain occasions he was spoken of as a star. Again, in the Slavonic Book of Enoch we read at length of the fall of Satan and of his proud boasting, in words which bear a marked resemblance to the following quotation from Isaiah:- "For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north. I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High." (verses 13 and 14.).

In the New Testament, when the Seventy returned joyfully from their mission, reporting the casting out of demons, Jesus, according to Luke (X. 18) says:- "I have seen Satan as ~~like~~ lightning falling from heaven." In our section on Luke we have given our reasons for suspecting that Jesus was not referring to the fall of Satan: but some of the Fathers began to associate this statement with the Isaiah passage. In this way we find that the latter came to be regarded as a reference to Satan. The first clear identification is made by Tertullian:-

"Undoubtedly he who raised up 'children of disobedience' against the Creator himself ever since he took possession of that 'air' of his; even as the prophet makes him say: 'I will set my throne (above the stars.....I will go up) above the clouds; I will be like the Most High.' This must mean the devil, whom in another passage (since such will they there have the apostle's meaning to be) we shall recognise in the appellation 'the god of this world.'" (Contra Marcion. Book V. p 459.).

Origen is similar. First he quotes in full the words of Isaiah, following this by the Lucan statement, and drawing the conclusion that the Saviour compares Satan to the lightning because he was light:-

"And notwithstanding he compares him to lightning, and says that he fell from heaven, that he might show by this that he had been at one time in heaven, and had had a place among the saints, and had enjoyed a share in that light in which all the saints participate, by which they are made angels of light, and by which the apostles are termed by the Lord the light of the world. In this manner, then, did that being once exist as light before he went astray, and fell to this place, and had his glory turned into dust, which is peculiarly the mark of the wicked, as the

prophet also says; whence, too, he was called the prince of this world, i.e. of an earthly habitation." (de Princip: Book I. 5.).

Jerome pressed the association still further, even going so far as to identify Lucifer with Satan and the old serpent:-

"For the blessed Job relates that even the angels and every creature can sin. ----- Lucifer fell who was sending to all nations, and he who was nurtured in a palace of delight as one of the twelve precious stones, was wounded and went down to hell from the mount of God. Hence the Saviour says in the Gospel: 'I beheld Satan falling as lightning from heaven.' If he fell who stood on so sublime a height, who may not fall? If there are falls in heaven, how much more on earth? And yet though Lucifer be fallen (the old serpent after his fall) his strength is in his loins and his force is in the muscles of his belly. The great trees are overshadowed by him, and he sleepeth beside the reed, the rush, and the sedge." (Contra Jovin: Book II. 4.).

Jerome had little admiration for Lucifer of Cagliari and his followers, and it may well be that he made a malicious play upon the Bishop's name. The latter stressed orthodoxy to such an extent that he

renounced communion with the Church in general on the grounds that it was tainted by reason of its compliance with Arianism. Some years after the death of Lucifer, Jerome wrote his *Dialogus Contra Luciferianos*, which takes the form of a debate between an orthodox Christian and a member of the Luciferan sect. Towards the end of the debate Orthodox strikes a cunning blow at those Christians who take their name from some other, such as Marcionites ---- it is left to the imagination to include the Luciferans --- suggesting that they are really followers, not of Christ, but of the Devil. "We ought to remain in that Church which was founded by the Apostles and continues to this day. If ever you hear of any that are called Christians taking their name not from the Lord Jesus Christ, but from some other, for instance Marcionites, Valentinians, Men of the Mountain or the Plain (Montenses sive Campitas) you may be sure that you have there not the Church of Christ, but the synagogue of Antichrist. And let them not flatter themselves if they have - as they think - Scripture authority for their assertions, since the devil himself quoted Scripture, and the essence of the Scriptures is not the letter, but the meaning."

(Contra Lucif: XXVIII.).

This, then, is the manner in which an innocuous epithet for the morning-star slowly evolved into the favourite name for Satan. Following the Vulgate, Wycliffe presented Isaiah XIV. 12 to the "English ploughboy" as:- "Hou felle thou, Lucyfer, fro heuene, the whiche erli sprunge." Later, Coverdale rendered the passage as follows:- "How art thou fallen from heaven (O Lucifer) thou faire morninge childe?", this being the conception which underlies Shakespeare's words:-

O! how wretched
Is that poor man, that hangs on princes' favours!
There is, betwixt that smile we would aspire to,
That sweet aspect of princes, and their ruin,
More pangs and fears than wars or women have:
And when he falls, he falls like Lucifer,
Never to hope again.

(Henry VIII. Act iii. Scene 2.).

APPENDIX A.

Table of instances where actions originally ascribed to God have later been attributed to the Devil, or to some other agency.

<u>ASCRIBED TO GOD</u>	<u>ASCRIBED TO SATAN</u>
(1). <u>God</u> causes David to number the people, and later punishes him. (II. Samuel, XXIV. 1.)	<u>Satan</u> or some earthly adversary causes David to number the people. (I. Chronicles, XXI. 1.)
(2). <u>God</u> tempts Abraham to offer up Isaac. (Genesis, XXII. 1.).	<u>Mastema</u> suggests to God that he should test Abraham. (Jubilees, XVII. 16.) <u>Satan</u> does this. (Talmud, Sanhedrin 89b.) Jealous angels did this. (Philo, Bib. Ant. XXXII. 1,2.)
(3). <u>God</u> smites all the firstborn of Egypt. (Exodus, XII. 29.)	<u>Mastema</u> slays all the first-born of Egypt. (Jubilees, XLIX. 2.)
(4). <u>God</u> attempts to kill Moses at the inn. (Exodus, IV. 24.)	<u>Mastema</u> attempts to kill Mose at the inn. (Jubilees, XLVIII. 2,3.) "The Angel of the Lord" does this. (LXX of Exodus, IV. 24.)
(5). "Blessed be <u>the Lord</u> my strength, which teacheth my hands to war, and my fingers to fight." (Psalm CXLIV. 1.)	<u>Azazel</u> teaches men to make weapons, etc. (Eth. Enoch, VIII. 1.). "And the third was <u>Gadreel</u> : he it is who showed men all the blows of death -- the sword -- all the weapons of death, etc." (Eth. Enoch, LXIX. 6.).

APPENDIX B.

Tables of several instances in later literature where the Devil is held responsible for actions not ascribed to him in earlier writings.

<p>(1). The Egyptian magicians perform marvellous deeds. (Exodus VII. 10ff.)</p>	<p><u>Mastema</u> gives them power to do this. (Jubilees, XLVIII, 9.). <u>Belial</u> raises up these. (Zad. Frags. VII. 19.)</p>
<p>(2). The Egyptians pursue the Israelites. (Exodus XIV.).</p>	<p><u>Mastema</u> causes them to do this. (Jubilees, XLVIII. 12.)</p>
<p>(3). The descendants of Noah fall into sin. (Genesis XI.)</p>	<p><u>Mastema</u> causes this (Jubilees, XI. 5.).</p>
<p>(4). Joseph's brethren seek to slay him. (Genesis XXXVII.).</p>	<p><u>Belial</u> prompts them to do this. (Test. Dan, I. 4-7.).</p>
<p>(5). Cain murders Abel. (Genesis IV.)</p>	<p><u>Satan</u> causes this through spite. (Theophilus, ad Aut: II. 29.) (Clem. Rom. ad Cor: III.)</p>
<p>(6). David lusts after Bathsheba. (II. Samuel, XI. 2)</p>	<p><u>Satan</u> breaks down the intervening screen. (Talmud, Sanhedrin, 107a.).</p>
<p>(7). Judas arranges to betray Jesus. (Matthew XXVI. 14) (Mark, XIV. 11.)</p>	<p><u>Satan</u> first enters into Judas. (Luke, XXII. 3.). (John, XIII. 27.). <u>Satan</u> (John, XIII. 2.). <u>The Devil</u>.</p>

(8). "Fear, and the pit, and the snare, are upon thee, O inhabitant of the earth."

(Isaiah, XXIV. 17.).

"This means the three nets of Belial."

(Zadokite Frags. VI. 9.).

(9). The Israelites murmur. 'The plague is begun.' 'There is wrath gone out from the Lord.'
(Numbers, XVI. 41ff.)

"Neither murmur ye, as some of them murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer."

(I. Corinthians, X. 10.).

(10). Adam and Eve perceive their nakedness, and make themselves aprons.

(Genesis, III. 7.).

The Devil persuaded them to do this; "that is by their friction he excited him to sexual pleasure."

(Methodius, Banq: Virgs: X.)

(11). The serpent responsible for the Fall.

(Genesis III.).

Satan seduced Eve.
(Slavonic Enoch, XXXI. 6.).

Gadreel seduced Eve.
(Ethiopic Enoch, LXIX. 6.).

Sammael takes the serpent as a garment.
(Greek Baruch, IX. 7.).

The Devil inspires the serpent.
(Lost Assumption of Moses.).

Satan, the Devil, and the serpent identified.
(Revelation, XII. 9; XX. 2.).

The Devil and the serpent identified.
(Wisdom, II. 24 - doubtful).